

APR 17 1941

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October; the REVIEW in four numbers in March, June, September, and December.

# The Classical Review

*Editors* | E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge  
C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

#### BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society  
J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.), PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., PROF. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A., F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.), PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.  
E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.B.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of  
PROF. J. L. MICHIE, University of Queensland, PROF. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and PROF. B. D. MERITT,  
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Volume LIV

DECEMBER 1940

Number 4

#### CONTENTS

THE FOOD OF ACHILLES. D. S. ROBERTSON	177
THE EVIDENCE FOR GREEK TIMEKEEPING. D. S. ROBERTSON	180
PLATO, <i>Republic</i> 621 A. D. E. EICHHOLZ	182
TWO NOTES ON PLATO'S <i>Laws</i> . R. G. BURY	183
THREE NOTES ON THE <i>Scripta Rhetorica</i> OF DIONYSIUS. S. F. BONNER	183
ASSONANCES OR PLAYS ON WORDS IN TACITUS. G. B. A. FLETCHER	184
AYTAPXIA. W. L. LORIMER	187
EARLY THREE-WORD IAMBIC TRIMETERS. W. B. STANFORD	187
GREEK <i>γνή</i> , ENGLISH <i>kin</i> . A. C. MOORHOUSE	187
ARISTOPHANES, <i>Birds</i> , 1122. D'A. W. THOMPSON	188
TWO NOTES ON LUCRETIUS. W. R. INGE	188
REVIEWS:	
Nonnos, <i>Dionysiaca</i> (Rouse), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 188; <i>Synesil Cyrenensis Hymni</i> (Terzaghi), J. TATE, 191; <i>ΕΙΔΟΣ et ΙΔΕΑ</i> (Brommer), J. TATE, 192; <i>Aristotle's Art of Poetry</i> (Fyfe), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 193; <i>Theophrastea</i> (Strömberg), D'A. W. THOMPSON, 195; <i>The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus</i> (Armstrong), J. H. SLEEMAN, 195; <i>Selections from St. John Chrysostom</i> (D'Alton), W. L. LORIMER, 197; <i>Etudes sur le vocabulaire épique dans l'Énéide; L'alliteration latine</i> (Cordier), F. H. SANDBACH, 198; <i>Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz</i> (Reitzenstein), G. A. HIGHER, 199; <i>Pliny, Natural History</i> , III (Rackham), R. G. AUSTIN, 200; <i>The Style of the Letters of St. Jerome</i> (Hritzu), <i>The Style of Pope St. Leo the Great</i> (Halliwell), J. W. PIRIE, 201; <i>The Athenian Archon List</i> (Dinsmoor), W. W. TARN, 202; <i>Plato's Law of Slavery in its Relation to Greek Law</i> (Morrow), A. W. GOMME, 204; <i>Calabria the First Italy</i> (Slaughter), P. N. URE, 205; <i>Abbreviations in Greek Inscriptions</i> (Avi-Yonah), A. M. WOODWARD, 206; <i>Christianity and Classical Culture</i> (Cochrane), R. M. HENRY, 207; <i>Church and State in the Later Roman Empire</i> (Charanis), J. N. L. MYRES, 208; <i>Zeus</i> , III (Cook), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 209; <i>ΔΡΑΓΜΑ</i> , J. TATE, 213; <i>Stoic, Christian and Humanist</i> (Murray), D. TARRANT, 214.	
SHORT REVIEWS . . . . .	215
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS . . . . .	217
CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	217
BOOKS RECEIVED . . . . .	219
INDEX . . . . .	219

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : HUMPHREY MILFORD

Price for single numbers, 3s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$2.55. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$5.32

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1. 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Mutcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Miss N. C. Jolliffe, Girton College, Cambridge) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton, and West Somerset.



Infectious disease, 100

CONTINUOUS FLOW

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

DECEMBER 1940

## THE FOOD OF ACHILLES

IN 'Two Swords: Two Shields',<sup>1</sup> Professor Beazley has lately called attention, after Drs. Eilmann and Gebauer, to the light that an early Attic neck-amphora (C.V.A. Berlin i, Pl. v) throws on the antiquity, denied by Radermacher,<sup>2</sup> of the tradition that Achilles was fed on the inwards of lions and on the marrows of boars and bears,<sup>3</sup> or on the marrows of lions and bears,<sup>4</sup> or on lion's flesh and she-wolf's marrow.<sup>5</sup>

The vase, which in Beazley's opinion can hardly be later than the middle of the seventh century, shows Peleus bringing the infant Achilles to Chiron, who carries, slung from a branch on his shoulder, not, as usual, dead hares or foxes, but three live cubs—first a young lion, next a young boar, and last a whelp which was described by Eilmann and Gebauer as a bear, but which Beazley convincingly identifies as a wolf. Beazley calls attention to Statius's she-wolf, and suggests, following Robert,<sup>6</sup> that all four animals may come from early epic, perhaps from the *Cypria*.

The purpose of my note is to support this suggestion, and to argue further that another detail, confined to Statius, which Beazley thought a Roman addition, may go back to the same source.

Achilles, in the *Achilleis*, questioned by Diomede about his life with Chiron, begins his answer thus:<sup>7</sup>

Dicor et in teneris et adhuc reptantibus annis,  
Thessalus ut rigido senior me monte recepit,  
non ullos ex more cibos hausisse nec almis  
überibus satiasse famem, sed spissa leonum  
uiscera semianimisque lupae traxisse medullas.

The word to which I would call attention is *semianimis*. It is plausible (with Beazley) to regard it as a macabre

embroidery of the Silver Age, but some facts may give us pause.

The general significance of such diet is familiar, and is illustrated by Frazer in two notes on Apollodorus<sup>8</sup> and more copiously in chapter xiii of his *Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*,<sup>9</sup> 'The Homoeopathic Magic of a Flesh Diet'. Of our Achilles story Frazer writes: 'The flesh and marrows of lions, wild boars, and bears were no doubt supposed to impart to the youthful hero who partook of them the strength and courage of these animals.' Frazer's illustrations from many times and places are ample but not exhaustive: his Norse examples, in particular, omit some of the most striking. We read, for instance, in the fourth stanza of the *Fragmentary Sigurd Lay* in the *Codex Regius* that Gutthorm had to be fed with the sliced and singed flesh of wolves and snakes before he and his brothers could be nerved to murder Sigurd. Again, in the *Volsunga Saga*, based partly on lost and partly on surviving Eddic poems, we are told that Sigurd gave Gudrun some of the dragon Fafni's heart to eat, 'and after that she was much grimmer than before and wiser'.

The fresher the flesh or the marrow, the stronger, presumably, will be the medicine: best of all, perhaps, to tear or suck them from a living body. There is, in fact, plenty of evidence that such practices have been followed by primitive peoples. The following are a few of the instances given by Frazer in *Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*.

The Ainos, believing that the water-ousel is wise and eloquent, hold that 'whenever he is killed, he should be at once torn open and his heart wrenched out and swallowed before it has time to grow cold or suffer damage of any kind. If a man swallows this, he will become very fluent and wise, and will be able

<sup>1</sup> *Bulletin van de Vereeniging tot Bevordering der Kennis van de Antieke Beschaving*, 1939, 4 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen*, 119.

<sup>3</sup> Apollodorus, *Bibl.* iii. 13. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Scholia on Homer, *Iliad*, xvi. 37.

<sup>5</sup> Statius, *Achill.* ii. 99 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Helden sagen*, i. 80, n. 3.

<sup>7</sup> ii. 96 ff.

4598-5

<sup>8</sup> *Bibl.* iii. 6. 8, and 13. 6.

<sup>9</sup> ii, 1912, pp. 138-68.

to argue down all his adversaries' (ii. 144). 'On extraordinary occasions the Dacotas used to perform a dance at which they devoured the livers of dogs raw and warm in order thereby to acquire the sagacity and bravery of the dog' (ib. 145). 'When Basutos of the mountains have killed a very brave foe, they immediately cut out his heart and eat it, this is supposed to give them his courage and strength in battle' (ib. 148).

Many other examples of drinking slain enemies' blood or sweat and of eating their entrails raw will be found on pp. 142 and 152 and in other parts of the same volume. Elsewhere Frazer refers to the Scythian custom, recorded by Herodotus,<sup>1</sup> by which a young warrior drank the blood of his first victim.

Greek and Roman examples are less easily found, but Frazer mentions that Pliny in the *Natural History*<sup>2</sup> describes and condemns the superstitions that eating a mole's fresh heart will confer the gift of prophecy, and that tooth-ache can be cured by a tooth drawn from a live mole: 'si quis cor eius recens palpitansque deuorarit'—'dente talpae uiuae exempto.' Frazer also places in the same context, no doubt rightly, the famous and horrible story that the dying Tydeus sucked Melanippus's living brains on the battlefield and thereby so disgusted Athena that he forfeited his chance of immortality. This incident is elaborately described by Statius,<sup>3</sup> who gave it to Dante,<sup>4</sup> and it might well have passed, like our *semianimis lupa*, for his own grisly invention, were it not also recorded by Apollodorus<sup>5</sup> and twice referred to in Ovid's *Ibis*.

The most striking lines in Statius are viii. 758 ff.:

iamque inflexo Tritonia patre  
uenerat et misero decus immortale ferebat,  
atque illum effracti perfusum tabe cerebri  
adspicit et uiuo scelerantem sanguine fauces  
(nec comites auferre ualent).

Ovid wishes *Ibis* to be both the per-

petrator of such an outrage and also its victim: first (l. 427 f.):

nec dapis humanae tibi erunt fastidia, quaque  
parte potes Tydeus temporis huius eris,  
and again (l. 515 f.):

Astacidaeque modo decisa cadauera truncu  
digna feris, hominis sit caput esca tuum.

There is also a remarkable red-figured Attic vase in New York, painted between 440 and 430 B.C., which illustrates with fifth-century restraint the story of Tydeus and Melanippus. On this vase, a badly broken bell-krater,<sup>1</sup> we see Tydeus sitting on a rock at the foot of a tree, wounded in the leg, and resting his head on his hand. At his feet lies the head of Melanippus. A young woman labelled *AOANAΣIA* approaches him, but Athena from behind grasps her wrist to draw her away. In Miss Richter's words, 'It is characteristic that the gruesome part of the legend—the sucking of Melanippus's brains by Tydeus, which disgusted Athena and lost Tydeus his immortality—is not here depicted'.

There is thus no *a priori* reason to doubt that in *semianimisque lupae*, as in Tydeus's savagery, Statius may have revived a piece of primitive savagery more congenial to the age of Juvenal and Martial than to that of Aeschylus and Sophocles. If, as I shall argue, it can be shown that Pindar knew and suppressed the tradition, its origin in the Cyclic epic becomes extremely probable.

It is obvious that this is the sort of story that Pindar, if he knew it, would be likely to reject.

Though less offensive, it is similar to the story so decisively rejected in the *First Olympian*—the story that Demeter bolted Pelops's shoulder at Tantalus's feast. There are many such rejections in Pindar. Some are explicit, but often he prefers to re-tell an old story in a form which pointedly omits or even logically excludes its offensive elements, without openly mentioning them. Miss

<sup>1</sup> iv. 64.

<sup>2</sup> xxx. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Theb.* viii. 717-67.

<sup>4</sup> *Inf.* xxxii. 130.

<sup>5</sup> *Bibl.* iii. 6, 8.

<sup>1</sup> Richter and Hall's *Red-Figured Attic Vases in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, No. 136 and plate 138.

M. C. van der Kolk has collected examples of all these methods:<sup>1</sup> I need not recall more than a few.

In the *Third Olympian*, ll. 16 ff., it is generally agreed that Pindar's emphatic phrases *πείσας* . . . *λόγω*, *ποτα* *φρονέων*, and *αἴτει* are chosen in order to refute a tradition that Heracles got the olive from the Hyperboreans by violence or fraud. In the *Third Pythian* Pindar rules out the crow which, as we know from a surviving fragment, brought Apollo news, in the *Μεγάλαι Ήσται*, of Coronis's wedding, by writing (ll. 27 ff.):

οὐδέ ἔλαβε σκοτόν· ἐδ' ἡ αρά μηλοδόκη Πνθῶντι τόσσας  
ἀκεν ναοῦ βασιλεὺς  
Λοβίας, κοινῶν παρ' εὐθυντάτῳ γνώμαν πιθῶν,  
πάντα λοιπνήν νόον.

In the *Fifth Pythian*, ll. 57 ff., it is likely that, where Pindar says that lions fled in terror from Battus when they heard his foreign speech, he is contradicting the story found in Pausanias,<sup>2</sup> that Battus was so frightened when he saw a lion in the desert that he shouted loud and clear and thus lost his defect of speech.

In the *Ninth Pythian*, ll. 41 ff., he seems to correct the Hesiodic tactlessness of making Apollo seriously consult Chiron about future events.

On the *Third Nemean*, l. 34, Miss van der Kolk accepts a suggestion of mine,<sup>3</sup> that Pindar's emphatic assertion that Peleus captured Iolcus *μόνος ἄνευ στρατῶν* was designed to refute, without mentioning it, the horrible story given by Apollodorus,<sup>4</sup> that Peleus led his army into the town through the severed body of Astydamia.

In many such passages Pindar chooses a word or phrase carefully designed to recall the rejected story: for instance, by writing in *Pyth.* iii. 28 *κοινῶν*, so suggestive of an informer more substantial than his own all-knowing mind.

With all this in mind, let us turn to another passage of the *Third Nemean*, the description (ll. 43-52) of the childhood of Achilles in Chiron's cave, which

begins *ξανθὸς δ' Ἀχιλλεύς*. Happily there is here no need to discuss the difficulties of reading and punctuation in ll. 45 and 46. It is clear in any case that Achilles is said to have killed lions and boars, and to have dragged their bodies to Chiron, beginning at the age of six.

The lines which I wish to examine closely are 48 and 49:

σώματα δὲ παρὰ Κρονίδαν  
Κένταυρον δοθμαίνοντα κόμιζεν,

This is the original reading of V, both in the text and in the lemma of the scholia, and also the present reading of D; but while all manuscripts agree on *δοθμαίνοντα*, for *σώματα* D originally had in the text, and still has in the lemma, the dative *σώματι*, while B, both in text and in lemma, has *σώματι*. It is usual and probably right to regard B's *σώματι* as a fusion of *σώματα* and *σώματι*, but it might be an accidentally substituted diminutive, and the real source of the reading *σώματι*. The scholiast's paraphrase in all the manuscripts begins *τῷ δὲ αὐτοῦ σώματι ἐνεργῶν δ' Ἀχιλλεύς ἀσθματος πλήρης*, which clearly implies the readings *σώματι* and either *ἀσθμαίνων* or (less probably) *ἀσθμαίνοντι*. Triclinius read *σώματι* and *ἀσθμαίνοντι*, and this reading was accepted by Hermann, Boeckh, and Tycho Mommsen, while Hartung read *σώματα* and *ἀσθμαίνων*, followed, *metri gratia*, by ἐκόμιζεν for *κόμιζεν*.

So far as the sense of *ἀσθμαίνειν* goes, it is equally appropriate, from Homer onwards, to the gasps of death and to the panting of physical exertion. In Pindar, indeed, the nearest parallel is *ἀσθματι . . . φρίσσοντα πνοὰς* of Castor's death-rattle in *Nem.* x. 74, but Aeschylus in *Eum.* 651 expresses by *οὐδὲν ἀσθμαίνων μένει* the effortless superiority of Zeus.

Mezger, and his disciple Bury, who seldom looked a gift gloss in the mouth, both followed Hartung with *σώματα* and *ἀσθμαίνων*, but this is having the best of both worlds, for the dative *σώματι* seems to be both an essential part of the variant, and also, as Dissen pointed out, indefensible, because of the meaningless emphasis conferred by its position in the sentence. All editors, and I think all other scholars, for the last fifty years,

<sup>1</sup> *Quaeritur quomodo Pindarus fabulas tractauerit quidque in eis mutarit*, Rotterdam, 1933.

<sup>2</sup> x. 15, 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Classical Review*, xxxvii, 1923, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> iii. 13. 7.

follow V, and Schroeder is justified in his comments on *σώματι . . . ἀσθμαίνοντι* ('bene refutavit Dissen') and on *σώματα . . . ἀσθμαίνω* ('plaudentibus quod mirere non paucis'). The passage may, therefore, confidently be examined on the assumption that V's reading, though possibly the result of correction—for V is a suspect witness—is in fact what Pindar wrote.

If so, why does Pindar tell us that the bodies were still panting when the child got them to the cave? Bury writes: 'There is little point in representing the beasts haled by Achilles as not yet dead (*ἀσθμαίνοντα*). Little point, perhaps, as Pindar chooses to tell the story, but what of the fresh marrow of the half-living she-wolf?

I suggest that Pindar here purposely keeps a detail from his epic source, while carefully excluding its original significance. In the epic the beasts were still breathing because Achilles wished to suck their living marrow in the cave.

It may well be that the following lines (50 ff.)

τὸν ἔθαμον Ἀρεψίς τε καὶ θρασεῖς Ἀθάνα  
κτείνοντι ἐλάφους ἀνεύ κυνῶν δολίων θ' ἐρκέακε.

should be connected in the same way with another tradition, found in Philostratus<sup>1</sup> and in the *Etymologicon Ma-*

<sup>1</sup> *Heroica*, xx. 2.

*num*,<sup>2</sup> that Achilles was nurtured on the marrows of fawns or deer: a dangerous diet, for what hero coveted *κραδίην ἐλάφου?*—and a diet avoided by the Dyaks of North-West Borneo for that very reason<sup>3</sup>—but a judicious mixture, as in modern synthetic medicines, could perhaps have combined the deer's speed with the lion's courage.

This deliberate rejection of the crude epic tradition has considerable significance in the *Third Nemean*, for Pindar is here anxious to emphasize the spiritual and intellectual character of Chiron's training of Achilles. Look at ll. 56 ff.:

νύμφευς δ' αὐτις ἀγλασκόπον  
Νηρέος θύγατρα, γόνον τέ οι φέρταν  
ἀγέναλλεν ἐν ἀρμένοισι πᾶσι θυμῷ αὐξένω,  
ὅφει θαλασσαῖς ἀνέμων ρύπαισι πεμφεῖται  
ὑπὸ Τροίαν δορίκτυπον ἀλαλάν Λυκίων τε προσμένοις  
καὶ Φρυγῶν  
Δαρδίνων τε, καὶ ἔγχεοφόρους ἐπιμείκας  
Αἰθίσπεσσον χείρας, ἐν φραισὶ πάξαισθ', δῆτας σφίσι μη  
κοίραντος ὅπλων  
πάλιν οίκαδ' ἀνέψιδος ζαμενῆς Ἐλένου Μέμνων μάδοι.

What a change from the little savage sucking brute fierceness from a panting she-wolf's marrow to the heroic child whose soul Chiron fosters by all things of good repute, and who holds fixed in his breast the courage never to submit or yield!

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

<sup>1</sup> s.v. Ἀχιλλεύς, p. 181.

<sup>2</sup> *Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*, ii. 144.

## THE EVIDENCE FOR GREEK TIMEKEEPING

IN proposing, like Krueger in 1855, to cut out as an interpolation the famous passage on *polos* and *gnomon* in Herodotus, ii. 109, 3, Professor J. E. Powell<sup>1</sup> understates the strength of the literary evidence for Greek sundials (in the widest sense) in classical times. It is true that the evidence connected with Anaximander and Anaximenes is late, though not necessarily worthless; but that for the fifth and fourth centuries cannot be lightly dismissed.

As for the antiquity of this sense of *polos*, the line which Powell quotes from Aristophanes's *Gerytades* is of course

corrupt, but Pollux, who had it intact, took it to refer to a sundial, and the man who first cited it presumably knew the context. Nor is this the only Aristophanic evidence, for E. Maass published from the Vatican manuscript of the *Isagoga* of Achilles, c. 29, both in 1892<sup>2</sup> and in 1896<sup>3</sup> a new fragment of the *Daitaleis* of 427 B.C., which has eluded Demiańskiuk: ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν τοῖς Δαιταλέσσων ἡ ἐπει ἥλον τροπίον τέθεικε τὸ σύνομα τοῦ πόλου καὶ θηλυκῶς πόλος τούτεστιν ἥλικολωνῶ ἐν φ σκέπτουσι τὰ μετέωρα ταντὶ καὶ τὰ πλάγια

<sup>1</sup> *Aratea*, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Comm. in Arat. Rel.*, p. 62.

<sup>1</sup> C.R. 1940, p. 69.

*ταντί.* Here too there is palpably much corruption, but the restorations of Maass and Wilamowitz (ἐπὶ ἡλιοτροπίον . . . πόλος τοῦτ' ἔστω, ἢ 'ν Κολωνῷ | ἀκοποῦσι . . .) must be on the right lines, and the passage is excellent contemporary evidence for an Athenian sundial in the third quarter of the fifth century.

The evidence for *gnomon* is less conclusive, but Powell's statement that the word occurs first in this sense in Philodemus is false. It is true that Liddell and Scott quote it from no earlier writer, but they give under *γνωμονικός* the phrase *γνωμονικὰ θεωρήματα* ('of or concerning sundials') from Hipparchus, *In Arati et Eudoxi Phaenomena Comment.* i. 9. 8. The passage is unambiguous and interesting—*τά τε γνωμονικὰ θεωρήματα πάντες γράφουσιν ἀπλατεῖς τοὺς κύκλους ὑποτιθέμενοι*, which Manitius renders 'Endlich nehmen alle Verfasser von Regeln für die Anfertigung von Sonnenuhren sämtliche Kreise ohne Breite an'. Nor is this all, for Hipparchus twice uses *γνώμων* itself unambiguously in this sense: i. 3. 6, ἐν μὲν τοῖς περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τόποις ὁ γνώμων λόγον ἔχει πρὸς τὴν ἰσημερινὴν σκιὰν ὃν ἔχει τὰ δ' πρὸς τὰ γ', and i. 4. 8, ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀθήνας τόποις καὶ ὁ σπουδαῖος γνώμων ἐπίτριτός ἔστι τῆς ἰσημερινῆς σκιᾶς. This 'Jugendwerk' of Hipparchus, as Heiberg calls it, can scarcely be later than the middle of the second century B.C. No earlier instance is certain, but Heath<sup>1</sup> accepts the view of Proclus<sup>2</sup> that the expression *κατὰ γνώμονα*, applied to a perpendicular let fall on a straight line from an external point, is derived from the *gnomon* of the sundial, and Proclus attests the use of this phrase by the fifth-century astronomer Oenopides: *τοῦτο τὸ πρόβλημα πρῶτον Οἰνοπίδης ἐζήτησεν, χρήσιμον αὐτὸν πρὸς τὴν ἀστρολογίαν οἰόμενος. ὀνομάζει δὲ τὴν κάθετον ἀρχαῖκῶν κατὰ γνώμονα, διότι καὶ ὁ γνώμων πρὸς ὅρθας ἔστι τῷ ὄριζοντι.*

Again Philochorus, an admirable witness, wrote at least as early as the first years of the third century, and his precise statement (quoted by Powell)

that Meton set up a *heliotropium* in the Pnyx in 433 B.C.—at a time when Herodotus was still engaged on his history—should not be called 'late' because it survives only in an Aristophanic scholium. It is also unreasonable to give no weight to Plutarch's statement<sup>1</sup> that Dionysius, perhaps the Younger, set up on Achradina a *ἡλιοτρόπιον καταφανὲς καὶ ὑψηλόν*, from which Dion delivered a speech in 357 B.C.

Moreover, though Vitruvius<sup>2</sup> starts his list of inventors of sundials with Berosus and probably aimed vaguely at chronological order, his classification is by types of dial, and he goes on to name among others (though with a third-century alternative, Apollonius) the great Eudoxus, who belongs largely to the first half of the fourth century. In such lists Vitruvius, whatever his intention, often in fact violates chronology, for instance in i. 1. 10, where Philolaus and Archytas stand after Aristarchus, and in ix. 6. 3, where Eudoxus comes first and Meton fourth in a string of astronomers.

Powell writes: 'The sentence *πόλον . . . Ἐλλῆνες*, which conflicts with our other evidence about Greek timekeeping, comes in here apropos of nothing.' It is not, however, unlike Herodotus to append in this manner a qualification to a too sweeping assertion (in this case the Egyptian origin of Greek geometry), and the difficulty of motive is not, in any case, wholly removed by the assumption of interpolation.

It is true that Salmasius and later specialists have argued that the early *heliotropia* were primarily designed to mark equinox and solstices, not the time of day, and that in particular they did not, any more than the human *στοιχεῖον*, divide the daylight, as later ancient sundials did, into twelve equal hours. This theory might, if accepted, slightly weaken the case for the authenticity of Herodotus ii. 109. 3, but the Aristophanic examples of *πόλος*, and the fact that Moschion, quoted by Athenaeus,<sup>3</sup> mentions a structure on Hieron's

<sup>1</sup> *History of Greek Mathematics*, i, p. 78.

<sup>2</sup> *ad Eucl. I.*, p. 283, 9, Friedlein.

<sup>1</sup> *Dion* 29.

<sup>2</sup> ix. 8, 1.

<sup>3</sup> v. 207 e.

ship which carried κατὰ τὴν ὁροφὴν πόλον ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Ἀχραδίνην ἀπομεμψημένον ἡλιοτροπίον, tell the other way.

Powell's statement that 'no such division of the day [into hours] is found before Plutarch' ignores not only the strong evidence for its use by Alexandrian astronomers in the third century B.C., but also the well-known passage of Pytheas of Marseilles, quoted by Geminus,<sup>1</sup> which Bilfinger cited in this connexion in 1886: *συνέβαινε γάρ περὶ τούτους τὸν τόπους τὴν μὲν νύκτα*

<sup>1</sup> *Isag.* 6, p. 70 Manitius.

παντελῶς μικρὰν γίνεσθαι ὥρῶν οἷς μὲν δύο, οἷς δὲ τριῶν, ὥστε μετὰ τὴν δύον μικροῦ διαλείμματος γνομένου ἐπανατέλλειν εὐθὺς τὸν ἡλιον. The old argument that the use of *μέρεα τῆς ἡμέρης* instead of *ὥρας* suggests that the Herodotean passage is pre-Alexandrine is not without force.

Be all that as it may, nothing is gained by belittling the evidence for the antiquity of *heliotropia*.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

### PLATO, REPUBLIC 621 A

*πορένεσθαι ἄπαντας εἰς τὸ τῆς Αἴθης πεδίον διὰ καῦματός τε καὶ πνίγους δευον.*

STALLBAUM has no note. Adam's note (vol. ii, p. 461) reads: 'J. and C. (Jowett and Campbell) explain this by saying that "they (the souls) are passing through the pillar of light". I do not think that this idea was present to the mind of Plato, though the souls are no doubt somewhere in this region. The *καῦμα* and *πνίγος δευον* are sufficiently appropriate touches without having recourse to so realistic an explanation.' *καῦμα* and *πνίγος* may be appropriate touches, but to say this is hardly an explanation. The tone of the whole Myth is sober; its details seem intended to be relevant to the theme, and are generally found to be so. If by 'appropriate touches' Adam meant details which are purely ornamental and have no further significance, then one may doubt whether they are really appropriate to the Myth at all. They should at least have some connexion with the theme.

The present passage seems to be explained by the remarks which follow at the end of 621 a, where the souls gather to drink at the river of Unmindfulness: *μέτρον μὲν οὖν τι τοῦ ὥδος πᾶσιν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι πιεῖν τοὺς δὲ φρονῆσει μὴ σωζομένους πλέον πίνειν τοῦ μέτρον τὸν δὲ ἀεὶ πόντα πάντων ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι.* This Adam explains by quoting Schneider's note: 'Qui nimium bibit, in perpetuum obliviscitur, qui moderate, discere aliquando seu recor-

dando scientiam repetere potest.' The *φρόνιμοι*, who are to enjoy the fruits of *ἀνάμνησις*, drink only the minimum and will recover their memory in time. The *ἄφρονες* drink too much and stand no chance of recovering it. But why are they bound to drink too much? Because they are fools? Possibly; but this is hardly sufficient explanation in itself. The true reason is surely that they, like the others, are suffering from the effects of their journey through the suffocating heat. But whereas the others have good sense enough to control their desires, they have not. The struggle between reason and desire has already begun and the result on this occasion will do much to determine the result in the life on earth which is to follow.

Plato does not labour the connexion between the *καῦμα* καὶ *πνίγος* and the drinking at the river. To do so would probably have been inartistic, and was in any case unnecessary since the Greeks were acutely conscious of the hardships entailed by exertion in extreme heat, as words like *ἡλιοσθαι* and *σκιαγροφεῖν* show. They would have no difficulty in seeing that the journey through the heat and the drinking at the river are integral parts of the same experience.

Stewart's translation 'through terrible burning heat and frost' (*The Myths of Plato*, p. 151) is plainly wrong, as is shown by the examples given in Liddell and Scott under *πνίγος*.

D. E. EICHHOLZ.

University of Bristol.

## TWO NOTES ON PLATO'S LAWS

824 a: πεζῶν δὴ μόνον θήρευοις τε καὶ ἄργα λοιπὴ τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν ἀλληλαγοῖς, ὃν οὐ μὲν τῶν εὐδόντων αὐτὰ μέρη, νυκτερεῖς κληθεῖσα, ἀργῶν ἀνδρῶν, οὐν δέξια ἐπαίνουν, οὐδὲ ἡ τῶν διαπαύματα πόνων ἔχουσα ἄρκνον τε καὶ πάγας ἀλλ' οὐ φιλοπόνου ψυχῆς νίκη χειρουμένων τὴν ἄγριον τῶν θηρίων ρώμην.

IN this passage, whereas England distinguishes 'two divisions of undesirable night-hunting', Burnet, followed by Taylor, makes no such distinction. In either case the words οὐδὲ ἡ τῶν in a 3-4 present difficulty. Burnet emends to οὐδὲ ἡ τῶν; England, following Adam, places a comma after τῶν. I think we should agree with England that there are two distinct kinds of night-hunters, 'watchers' and 'trappers'; but it is difficult to accept his view that the τῶν can be connected with the distant χειρουμένων, with the text as it stands. Hence I formerly (in the Loeb edition) read η τοι. Now, however, I should prefer to transpose διαπαύματα πόνων ἔχουσα to a place after κληθεῖσα. This would remove the difficulty of connecting τῶν with χειρουμένων, leaving it where Ast wished to put it, next to ἄρκνοι, and it would give the 'intervals of rest' to the

'watchers', rightly, rather than to the 'trappers'. To explain the dislocation I assume that the words δ. π. ἔχ. (21 letters) formed a line which was omitted by error (due to homoeoteleuton) and reinserted in the wrong place. (For similar omissions, cp. L. A. Post, *The Vatican Plato*, p. 12.) If it be objected that these words are tautologous after τῶν εὐδόντων κατὰ μέρη, it is open to us to regard them as a marginal duplicate of that phrase wrongly inserted in the body of the text. There are, I think, a good many instances of that sort of thing in the *Laws*. In any case δ. π. ἔχ. must be ejected from their present position.

960 b: τῶν πάντων δὲ ἐκάστοτε τέλος οὐ τὸ δράσαι τι σχεδὸν οὐδὲ τὸ κτήσασθαι κατοικίσαι τ' ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τῷ γεννηθέντι σωτηρίαν ἐξευρόντα κτλ.

Hitherto no one, apparently, has questioned κτήσασθαι, but I cannot believe that it is the right word in this context. I would replace it by στήσασθαι, 'institute', 'establish'.

R. G. BURY.

Cambridge.

THREE NOTES ON THE *SCRIPTA RHETORICA*  
OF DIONYSIUS(1) *De Lysia*, c. 6 (= i. 14 U.-R.)

ταύτην (sc. τὴν συστρέφουσαν τὰ νοήματα καὶ οπραγγύλως ἐκφέρουσαν λέξιν) ὀλίγοι μὲν ἐμμῆσαντο, Δημοσθένης δὲ καὶ ὀπερεβάλετο πλήν οὐτῶν γε λευκῶς οὐδὲ ἀφελῶς ὥσπερ Λυτας χρημάτευεν αὐτῇ, ἀλλὰ περιέργως καὶ πικρῶς.

οὐτῶς γε λευκῶς Radermacher, probante Usenero; οὐτῶς εὐτελῶς Gv, οὐτῶς τελευκῶς FMPB.

τελευκῶς is obviously corrupt, and, as Mr. Lockwood has observed in *C.Q.* xxxxi (1937), pp. 200-1, εὐτελῶς is too depreciatory, while γε λευκῶς introduces (a) a critical term not otherwise found in D., and (b) an idea of transparency not necessitated by the context. Lockwood's ἀνεπιτηδεύτως, however (anticipated by Kiessling, who did not, as L. says, accept εὐτελῶς—see *Rh.M.* xxiii [1868], p. 253), is on palaeographical grounds improbable; for even if we assume that ἀνεπι dropped out at the end of a line, there would be little

reason for τηδεύτως taking the forms offered by our manuscripts. The conjecture ἐπιεικῶς (incorrectly attributed by L. to Roberts) was made by Desrousseaux; but here again, explanation of the corruption is difficult.

I propose therefore to read here οὐτῶς γε λεπτῶς. λεπτός, like *subtilis* (which is itself so commonly applied to Lysias by Roman critics), was transferred to literary criticism from the art of weaving, in which it meant 'of thin, fine texture' (see La Rue van Hook, *Metaph. Termin. of Gk. Rhet. and Lit. Crit.*, p. 37); and, like *subtilis*, acquired the meanings of 'refined', 'delicate', and so 'precise' and even 'simple', 'plain' (cf. Roberts, *Three Lit. Lett.*, p. 196; Geigenmüller, *Quaest. Dionys.*, pp. 15 and 21). It is quite commonly used by D. to describe a plain style; cf. *De Imit.* c. 6, *De Dem.* cc. 5, 27, 29, and especially c. 13 ὅλος

ἐστὶν ἀκριβής καὶ λεπτός καὶ τὸν Λυσιακὸν χαρακτῆρα ἐκμέμακται εἰς ὄνυχα, and *De Isaeo*, c. 20 καθαρὸς μὲν καὶ λεπτός καὶ δεινὸς εὑρεῖν τε καὶ εἴπειν στρογγύλως καὶ περιττώς, δὲ βούλεται. So in *Hermogenes II. 'Id.* B p. 406 R. and p. 407 (bis), the style of Aeschines Socratus, and that of Nicostratus, are labelled not only ἀφελῆς but also λεπτός. The term is again applied to Lysias (though disparagingly) by Plut. *De Aud.* 9 ἐν τρίβωνι Λυσιακοῦ λόγου λεπτῷ. In the present passage, I would render 'not with such delicacy or simplicity'. The metaphorical use of λεπτός as a stylistic term is barely noticed in LS., and it may be added to Lockwood's list in *C.Q.* 1937.

Finally, the confusion of λεπτός and λευκός is well attested. Thus, at Eur. *Or.* 140 some manuscripts (including those of D. himself, who quotes the line in *C.V.* c. 11) read λευκόν against the better λεπτόν. Similarly, a fragment of Aristoph. *Gerytades* (Kock, *Com. Att. Frag.* i. 429) is quoted by Athenaeus (ix, p. 367 B) with the reading λευκούς ἀλλα, whereas Pollux (vi. 65) quotes the same fragment with λεπτούς. It may be added that at Eur. *Med.* 1189 similar variants occur, though λεπτήν there may possibly be a false repetition from λεπτοί in the preceding line.

(2) *Ep. ad Amm.* i. c. 2 (= i. 259)

ἴνα μὴ τοῦθ' ὑπολάβων, ὅτι . . . οὐδέ *ἄν* αὐτὸς δὲ Δημοσθένης δέ πάντας ὑπερβαλόμενος τοὺς τε πρὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς καθ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ μηδὲ τοὺς γνομένους ὑπερβολὴν καταλιπὼν τοσοῦτος ἔγνετο . . . εἰ μὴ τὰς Ἀριστοτέλους τέχνας ἔξεμάθεν.

οὐδέ *ἄν* Usener, οὐτε libri; γνομένους libri, γενησομένους H. Stephanus.

Clearly γνομένους is difficult in reference to succeeding orators; but Stephanus' γενησομένους (generally adopted by subsequent editors up to U.-R., and Roberts) is not in accordance with D.'s practice. This would be to write ἐπιγνομένους; cf. the very similar passage in *De Lys.* c. 1 τῶν μὲν ἐμπροσθεν γενο-

μένων ῥήτορων ἡ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἀκμασάντων ἡγάνισε τὰς δόξας, τῶν δὲ ἐπιγνομένων οὔτε πολλοῖς τισ κατέλιπεν ὑπερβολὴν κτλ., also ib. c. 13 *init.*; *De Dem.* c. 1 *sub fin.*; ib. c. 21 (ώστε μηδενὶ τῶν ἐπιγνομένων ὑπερβολὴν λειφθῆναι, where the form ἐπιγνομένων should be written), and *Ep. ad Pomp.* c. 3.

(3) *De Comp. Verb.* c. 6 (= ii. 28)

τὰ δὴ παραπλησία φῆμι δεῖν καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα εὐ συνθέσεων τὰ τοῦ λόγου μόρια, πρώτον μὲν σκοπεῖν, ποιὸν ὄνυμα ἡ βῆμα ἡ τῶν ἄλλων τι μορίων ποιῶν συνταχθὲν ἐπιτηδείως ἔσται κείμενον καὶ πᾶς εὖ ἡ ἀμεινὸν (οὐδὲ γάρ δὴ πάντα γε μερὰ πάντων τιθέμενα πέφυκεν ὄντις διατίθεντας ἀκόας). ἔπειτα κτλ.

εὖ ἡ Usener, οὐκ libri, et cett. edd.

D. is here comparing the art of composition to that of building and ship-building. The chief objection to the MS. reading πᾶς οὐκ ἀμεινὸν is that the litotes is a difficult one (despite H. Richards, *C.R.* xix [1905], p. 252; cf. Roberts's edn. ad loc.). 'Not better', i.e. 'worse', is an odd contrast to 'suitably', and it is hard to believe that ἀμεινὸν here could lose its comparative force entirely. Moreover, the analogy is very carefully followed out throughout the chapter, and neither in the opening passage nor in the corresponding ποιῶ δεῖ λίθω τε καὶ ἔνιλω καὶ πλίνθῳ ποιῶν ἀρμόσαι λίθον ἡ ἔνιλον ἡ πλίνθον which follows it, is there any mention of seeing how the component parts would not fit. Usener's εὖ ἡ ἀμεινὸν is extremely awkward after ἐπιτηδείως, and is rightly rejected by both Richards and Roberts. All that is required is a change of punctuation: (καὶ πᾶς οὐκ ἀμεινὸν; οὐ γάρ δὴ κ.τ.λ.)—'and surely this is the wiser course, for . . .'. For the quite common use of ἀμεινὸν with ἐστι understood cf. LS. s.v., and for the interjection of a short sentence of this kind cf. the idiom οὐ γάρ ἀμεινὸν (Hesiod, *W.D.* 750, *Hdt.* i. 187, iii. 71 &c.).

S. F. BONNER.

University of Liverpool.

ASSONANCES OR PLAYS ON WORDS IN TACITUS

AT *Hist.* i. 13. 3, eoque Poppaeam Sabinam, principale scortum, ut apud consicum libidinum deposuerat, donec

Octauiam uxorem amoliretur. mox suspectum in eadem Poppaea in provinciam Lusitaniam specie legationis

seposuit, Andresen raises, but does not discuss, the question whether there is an intentional play on the words 'deposuerat' and 'seposuit'. It seems worth while bringing together the evidence in Tacitus which can assist an answer to the question.

Tacitus is fond of alliteration, and W. Renz in his *Alliterationen bei Tacitus* (Aschaffenburg, 1905) quotes a number of examples of collocations of words which are similar in more than the first letter. I quote examples which he does not include: *Dial.* 20. 3 *uulgus quoque adsistentium et adfluenus et uagus auditor adsuexit iam exigere laetitiam*; *Agr.* 31. 1 *inter uerbera et contumelias conteruntur*; 38. 3 *praefecto classis circumuehi Britanniam praecipit*: *datae ad id uires, et praecesserat terror*; *Hist.* i. 29. 2 *cum maxime discam ne secundas quidem minus discriminis habere*; ii. 68. 3 *sed erant agminis coactores: agniti dempsere sollicitudinem*; iii. 15. 1 *disordes animis, discretos uiribus*; 40. 2 *inutili cunctatione agendi tempora consultando consumpsit*; 71. 4 *sic Capitolium clausis foribus indefensum et indireptum conflagravit*; iv. 4. 2 *mox deos respexere*; *restitui Capitolium placuit*; 16. 3 *pars remigum e Batauis tamquam imperitia officia nautarum propugnatorumque impediabant*; *Ann.* iii. 17. 2 *Vitellii et Veranii uoce defletum Caesarem, ab imperatore et Augusta defensam Plancinam*; xv. 10. 1 *si Paeto aut in suis aut in alienis consiliis constantia fuisse*; 54. 3 *at praemia penes unum fore, qui indicio praeuenisset*.

Words with strongly similar terminations at the ends of clauses are not very common: *Hist.* ii. 7. 1 *bello ciuili uictores uictosque numquam solida fide coalescere*, nec referre Vitellium an Othonem superstitem fortuna faceret: *rebus secundis etiam egregios duces in solescere*; *Ann.* iv. 38. 1 *rerum uestiarum prouidum, constantem in periculis, offensionum pro utilitate publica non pauidum*; xi. 23. 4 *duces exercitus nostros ferro uique ceciderint*, diuum Iulium apud Alesiam obsederint; xii. 53. 2 *ueterrimam nobilitatem usui publico postponeret seque inter ministros principis haberi sinceret*; xiv. 44. 1 *sane con-*

*silium occultauit, telum inter ignaros parauit.*<sup>1</sup>

There are some examples of verbs compounded with different prepositions in the same sentence or in adjacent sentences: *Agr.* 28. 2 *mox ad aquandum atque utilia raptum egressi et cum plenisque Britannorum sua defensantium proelio congressi*; *Hist.* ii. 61 *grauissima ciuitas electa iuuentute, adiectis a Vitellio cohortibus, fanaticam multitudinem disiecit: captus in eo proelio Maricuss ac mox feris obiectus*; *Ann.* i. 68. 3 *impetu tergis Germanorum circumfunduntur . . . sonus tubarum, fulgor armorum, quanto inopina, tanto maiora offenduntur*; iii. 62. 2 *dictatoris Caesaris ob uetusta in partis merita et recens diu Augusti decretum adulere, laudati quod Parthorum inruptionem nihil mutata in populum Romanum constantia pertulissent*; 69. 3 *ideo leges in facta constitui, quia futura in incerto sint: sic a maioribus institutum ut, si antissent delicta, poenae sequerentur*; iv. 66. 2 *Publum Dolabellam socium delationis extitisse miraculo erat . . . restitit tamen senatus*; xiv. 4. 2 *satis constitit extitisse proditorem.*<sup>2</sup> There is an example of a noun with varied prefix in *Ann.* iv. 49. 1 *obsidium coepit per praesidia*.

I quote other passages where the question may perhaps not unreasonably be asked whether there is an intended play on words. I give no answers: *ex ingenio suo quisque demat uel addat fidem*. But in order to suggest caution in some places, and by way of showing where I have tried to draw the line, I point out that I have excluded these passages among others: *Agr.* 36. 1 *quattuor Batauorum cohortes ac Tungorum duas cohortatus est*; *Hist.* i. 32. 1 *uniuersa iam plebs Palatum implebat*; iv. 17. 2 *prouinciarum sanguine provincias uinci*; *Ann.* i. 47. 3 *adornauit naues*; 51. 1 *quo latior populatio foret*; ii. 85. 3 *satis uisum de Vistilia statuere*; xv. 13. 2 *uis si ingrueret, prouisus exemplis*. This, then, is my list: *Agr.* 31. 4 *exurere coloniam, expugnare castra, ac nisi felicitas in socordiam uertisset*,

<sup>1</sup> See also *Hist.* i. 64. 3 and *Ann.* xiv. 6. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See also *Hist.* iii. 3 and iv. 16. 1.

*exuere iugum potuere; Germ.* 30. 1 *durant* si quidem colles, paulatim rarescunt, et Chatto suos saltus Hercynius prosequitur simul atque deponit: *duri* genti corpora . . .; *Hist.* i. 3. 2 adprobatum est non esse curae deis securitatem nostram, esse ultiōnem; 16. 1 *optimum* quemque *adoptio* inueniet; 18. 2 ac ne dissimulata seditio in maius crederetur, *ultra* adseuerat quartam et duoetūcensimam legiones, paucis seditionis auctoribus, non *ultra* uerba ac uoces errasse; 27. 1 *instantes* insidias ac domesticum hostem praedicit, audiente Othonē (nam proximus *adstiterat*); 48. 4 *Vinius* proconsulatu Galliam Narbonensem seuere integreque rexit; mox Galbae amicitia in abruptum tractus, audax callidus promptus et, prout animum intendisset, prauus aut industrius, eadem *ui*; 54. 2 nec procul seditione aberant, cum Hordeonius Flaccus *abire* legatos . . . iubet; ii. 23. 5 acerrima seditionum ac discordiae incitamenta, interfectores Galbae, scelere et metu uecordes miscere cuncta; 84. 2 Vespasiano inter initia imperii ad *obtinendas* iniquitates haud perinde *obstinante*; iii. 27. 3 disiectam fluitantemque testudinem lanceis contisque *scrutantur*, donec soluta compage scutorum exangues aut laceros prosternerent multa cum strage; 44 capto Valente *cunctā* ad uictoris opes conursa, initio per Hispaniam a prima Adiutrice legione orto, quae memoria Othonis infensa Vitellio decimam quoque ac sextam traxit. nec Galliae *cunctā* bantur; 50. 3 teneri praesidiis Appenninum *rebantur*: et ipsos in regione bello attrita inopia et seditiosae militum uoces terrebant; 70. 4 ne a militibus *internuntius* inuisae pacis *interficeretur*; iv. 67. 2 *resipiscere* paulatim ciuitates fasque et foedera *respicere* (cp. v. 25. 2 respicerent followed eight lines later by *ni resipiscere* incipiant); 68. 1 *Domitiani indomitae libidines*; *Ann.* i. 4. 4 annis quibus Rhodi specie *secessus* exulem egerit aliud quam iram et simulationem et *secretas* libidines meditatum; 9. 4 postquam hic *socordia* senuerit, ille per libidines pessum datus sit, non aliud *discordantis* patriae *remedium* fuisse; 24. 1 haec audita quamquam *abstrusum* et tristissima quaeque maxime occul-

tantem Tiberium perpulere, ut *Drusum* filium cum primoribus ciuitatis duabusque praetoriis cohortibus mitteret (cp. xiii. 43. 2 Q. Pomponium ad necessitatem belli ciuilis *detrusum*, Iuliam *Drusi* familiam Sabinamque Poppaeam ad mortem actas); iv. 53. 2 Germanici coniugem ac liberos eius recipere *dignarentur*: sed Caesar non *ignarus* quantum ex re publica peteretur . . .; vi. 32. 2 et Phraates apud Syriam, dum *omisso* cultu Romano, cui per tot annos insueuerat, instituta Parthorum *sumit*, patrii moribus impar morbo *assumptus* est: sed non Tiberius *omisit* *incepta*; xii. 11. 1 *omissa* Tiberii memoria, quamquam is quoque *miserat*; 31. 4 ea *munimenta* dux Romanus, quamquam sine robore legionum sociales copias ducebat, per rumpere adgreditur et distributis cohortibus turmas quoque peditum ad *munia* accingit; xii. 46. 3 augetur *flagitiī* merces, et Pollio occulta corruptione impellit milites ut pacem *flagitarent*; xiii. 43. 4 puniendos rerum atrocium ministros, ubi pretia scelerum *adepti* sclera ipsa aliis delegent: igitur *adempta* bonorum parte . . .; xiv. 21. 3 laetitiae magis quam lasciuiae dari paucas totius quinquennii noctes, quibus tanta luce *ignium* nihil illicitum occultari queat: sane nullo *insigni* de honestamento id spectaculum transiit; xv. 39. 1 Nero *Anti* agens non *ante* in urbem regressus est quam . . .; 49. 3 Quintianus mollitia corporis *infamis* et a Nerone probroso carmine *diffamatus* contumeliam ultum ibat; xvi. 6. 2 *differtum* odoribus conditur tumuloque Iuliorum *infertur*.<sup>1</sup>

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

*King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

<sup>1</sup> Mr. E. Koestermann's recent Teubner edition is careless and unreliable. In the text he repeats all Andresen's six misprints at *Hist.* i. 33. 2, *Ann.* i. 68. 3, iv. 30. 2, xi. 30. 2, xii. 10. 1 and 41. 2, and adds *modo* for *modum* at *Hist.* iv. 9. 1 and *monumentum* for *momentum* at *Ann.* xvi. 5. 1 together with a dozen others of his own elsewhere. In the apparatus criticus 168 conjectures appear as Mr. Koestermann's, of which 47 are placed in the text. Of this total number of 168 at least twenty-three belong to someone else and restitution should be made as follows: *Ann.* i. 69. 2 *laudes et gratis* Halm; ii. 1. 1 [Sisenus] Andresen; iii. 18. 1 *Iulli* Andresen; vi. 14. 2 *sane* Andresen; 37. 3 *Tigri* Halm; xi. 4 1 et Acidalius; 28. 1 *discidium* Lallemand; xii. 63. 1 *parte* Walter; xiii. 55. 3 *aspiciens* Rhenanus; xiv.

59. 3 *cur-timuisti* Halm; xvi. 2. 2 *in* Draeger; *Hist.* i. 8. 2 *elati* Lipsius; 31. 1 *signa seu* Meiser; 37. 5 *Heli* Halm; 85. 1 *parata* W. Heraeus; ii. 4. 4. *fauor* Jacob; 20. 1  *tegumen* Valmaggi; 82. 2 *ne* codd. rec.; 84. 2 *largitus* Rhenanus; iii. 38. 4 *fouet* Oberlin; 82. 3 *diei* Lipsius; iv. 25. 3 *armatae* codd. rec.; *Germ.* 43. 2 [montium] Andresen. There are also passages where a conjecture of Mr. Koestermann's differs only slightly from one which he does not mention, as *Hist.* iv. 58. 1 *honestam* Lipsius *honestum* K., and *Agr.* 29. 1 (*sequentis*) Brotier (*insequentis*) K.

Mr. Koestermann makes a mass of other mistakes, some of which I correct thus: *Ann.* i. 28. 3 *si qui alii* Lipsius; 44. 5 *centurionatus inde exegit* J. F. Gronouius; 77. 4 *secantur* Heinsius; ii. 5. 2 *uices* Acidalius; 8. 1 *ausurum* not Andresen, for see Walther; iii. 3. 3 *Augustae* Kritz; 12. 2 *sed* Ernesti; 46. 2 *affluentes* Andresen (*Ph. W.* 1883, 1464); iv. 28. 1 *pater oranti filio comparatus* Halm; 33. 1 *confata* Kiessling; v. 4. 1 *esse seni* Walther; vi. 5. 2 *quae* J. Gronouius; 13. 1 *e uulgo*; xi. 4. 1 *ac* Pichena; 26. 3 *pudoris prodigos* Walter; 38. 3 *fastidiis* or *fastidio* Ernesti; xii. 25. 2 *eundem in* Halm; 41. 2 *triumphali cum ueste* Freinsheim, *pueri* ed. Spir.; 45. 3 *pecunia multarentur* Victorius,

*Pharasmanen* Halm; 46. 3 *amissuros* Becher; xiii. 6. 3 *multa* cod. Corb.; 20. 2 *si qui* Walther; 44. 4 *isse* Lipsius; 57. 2 [uicta] Agricola; xiv. 33. 2 *militare horreum* anonymous in Madvig, *Adu. crit.* iii. p. 234; 36. 2 *paucos esse* cod. Guelf.; xv. 58. 3 *et fortuitus* Walther; xvi. 17. 5 *addit* Agricola; 21. 1 *islaisticis* Pignorius.

*Hist.* i. 3. 1 *necessitates ipsa necessitate fortiter toleratae* J. S. Müller, *par* cod. rec.; 62. 2 *nomine...* *additio* codd. rec.; ii. 24. 3 *e* cod. Guelf.; 34. 2 *insuper* codd. rec.; 77. 2 *tu ex tuto* Gerber; iii. 5. 1 *Iazygum* Beroaldus; 9. 3 *Messala* cod. corr. (Ritter); 11. 4 *militis* J. Gronouius; 13. 3 *etiam militem auferre* Jacob; 16. 2 *in* cod. Bud.; 54. 1 *uera* codd. rec.; 78. 1 *Saturno* Ruperti; iv. 7. 2 *Senecione* Puteolanus; 46. 3 *postremo* Agricola; *Germ.* 2. 3 *auditum* Lipsius; 30. 1 *durantes quidem* Gudeman; 36. 2 *fracti* Hummel; *Agr.* 10. 3 *fama*. *sed transgressi* et Purser; 16. 4 [et] John; 28. 1 *rem agente* Bitschofsky; 36. 3 *instantes* Ruperti; *Dial.* 13. 6 *statuae* Hess; 22. 5 *obsolete* Gudeman.

Mr. J. Jackson claims thirteen conjectures in his recent edition of the *Annals*. He is at least the fourth person to propose *custodes adessent* at xv. 43. 3, and *tibiis perdoctus* at xiv. 60. 2 belongs to Hiller.

#### AYTAPXIA

By some mischance, doubly unfortunate in these days when the baser sort of newspaper confounds autarky and autarchy, the word *aytaphxa*, for which the old L. & S. quotes Dio Cassius xlv. 1, has been omitted from the new edition. According to Nawijn's Index to Dio s.v. it occurs six times

in the intact books of that author, while there are nine instances in the parts preserved only in epitome.

W. L. LORIMER.

University of St. Andrews.

#### EARLY THREE-WORD

#### IAMBIC TRIMETERS

As a supplement to my article on this type of line in tragedy (*C.R.* liv, 1940, pp. 8-10) here are references to the few that appear in earlier iambic writers (cited from Diehl's *Anth. Lyr. Gr.*): Semonides, fr. 7, ll. 40, 66, 118; Iambica adespota 10 and 16 B 2. There is a three-word scazoon in Hippoanax 12. 2. These all belong to the simplest kind, that is, a combination of three-, four-, and five-syllable words in various orders, except

Semonides 7. 118, which has the (3+2+7) formation. The frequency of 3 in 118 lines in Semonides is higher than the average in any tragedy, the nearest being Aeschylus' *Septem* with an average of 3 in 126. On the other hand ll. 431-96 of that play and ll. 235-307 of Aeschylus' *Supplices* contain 4 each.

W. B. STANFORD.

Trinity College, Dublin.

#### GREEK FYNH, ENGLISH KIN

IN G. Thomson's *Oresteia*, ii. p. 385, there is an argument advanced from philology to support the conclusion that the oldest system of reckoning kinship traced descent through the female only. I quote. 'In the case of the Indo-European peoples, this conclusion is supported by linguistic evidence. As F. Engels observed (*Origin of the Family*, p. 103), the root for *kin* (Greek *γένος*, Latin *gens*, Irish *cine*) is identical with the root for "woman" (Greek *γυνή*, Sanskrit *jani*, Russian *zhena*, Irish *bean*, English *queen*), and this implies that kinship was originally traced through the woman.'

In this argument there are two serious defects. First, even if we could assume the 'identity' of the two roots, the implication does not follow. Greek *γένος*, Sanskrit *janaḥ*, Latin *genus* (a closer parallel than *gens*) have the meaning 'race', a develop-

ment of 'birth': cf. *γυναι*, *gigno*. So the proposed identification would only suggest a connexion between the ideas 'woman' and 'birth', which is not an unreasonable one. Secondly, the roots are by no means identical, since *γένος* &c. have a palatal guttural, while *γυνή* &c. have a labio-velar (hence Vedic *gnā*, Gk. *μνάσαι*, Boeot. *βανά*). This guttural distinction appears everywhere in the many forms in which the two roots occur in the IE. languages, though not always obvious on the surface, and it is a decisive one. Childe's claim (*The Aryans*, p. 81) that IE. does not provide evidence of matrilineal descent is therefore unaffected by Professor Thomson's example.

A. C. MOORHOUSE.

University College, Swansea.

ARISTOPHANES, *Birds*, 1122

Pace Professor Rose (*C.R.* liv. 79), there is nothing to suggest that the messenger was a bird, any more than the herald in the same play. He comes running in (*τρέχει*), as a pigeon would be the last bird to do; he comes puffing and panting, *pouf, pouf*, after his run, to tell what the birds are doing; and what they did surprised him mightily—*ὅρνθες, οὐδεὶς ἀλλος . . . ὥστε θαυμάσεν ἐγώ*. Certainly he was not one of themselves. Moreover, no carrier-pigeon announces his arrival with a loud *πού, πού*: the homing bird slips silently and secretly into the dove-cote, and, like other pigeons, his only time for cooing is when he is making love. The cuckoo says *coo-coo*, and so does the hoopoe, and the crowing cock comes near it now and then; but the moan of doves and the roucoulement of the *βαρύθυοργοι πέλειαι* is quite another thing. Professor Rose says

that my reference to Paus. ii. 9 'should be deleted, since he does not mention the subject at all'. The fact is that Aelian (*V.H.* ix. 2), telling how the news of Tauosthenes's Olympian victory was carried to Aegina in a day, has two versions of the story: that the news was brought by an apparition (*ὑπὸ φάσματος*), or, as some say, by a pigeon—*περιστέραι* and *πελειάς* are both used, though *φάσια* is the word likely to be confused with *φάσμα*. Anyway, Pausanias tells the story only of the apparition, with no word of the pigeon. Apart from this doubtful instance, the only references to pigeon-messengers in Greek are the Anacreontic *ἔρασμιν πέλεια* and one short reference in Athenaeus.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

*University of St. Andrews.*

## TWO NOTES ON LUCRETIUS

ii. 40. si non forte tuas legiones per loca campi  
fervere cum videas bellū simulacra crientis.

*Tuas* seems not to have been suspected, but I am convinced that we should read *duas*. There is no reason to think, with Munro and Rouse, that Caesar may be referred to. *Tuas* could only mean Memmius, who had no legions under his command. *Two legions*, 'subsidii magnis et ecum vi constabilitae', pitted against each other, would be enough, indeed more than enough, to fill the Campus Martius, which was already encroached upon by buildings.

But does *campi* refer to the Campus Martius, as all the editors say? I think not. Almost within the city, it would be a most unlikely place for manoeuvres. Lucretius must have been witnessing manoeuvres, for they are very much in his

mind in Book ii. Cf. ii. 6 and 324; in both of these places *campi* in the plural, which of course cannot refer to the Campus Martius, occurs; and also 118 and 119. Or *legiones* may mean 'armed forces', as in iii. 1030, not 'legions' in the technical sense.

v. 1188-93. In re-reading this famous passage I was at once convinced that we should read *sol* for *nox* in 1189, and *ros* for *sol* in 1192. I find that I have been anticipated by Lambinus in both these emendations, which have unaccountably found little favour. It is inconceivable to me that Lucretius should not have mentioned the 'sun' in 1189; the 'night' could hardly be said to 'roll through the sky'; and in 1192 *sol* between *nubila* and *imbris* is almost absurdly out of place.

W. R. INGE.

## REVIEWS

## THE LOEB NONNOS

Nonnos: *Dionysiaca*. With an English translation by W. H. D. Rouse, mythological introduction and notes by H. J. ROSE, and notes on text criticism by L. R. LIND. In three volumes: I (Books I-XV), pp. li+533. II (Books XVI-XXXV), pp. xi+547. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1940. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net each.

IN these two volumes (and in a third which is to follow) the publishers of the Loeb series offer the first English translation of Nonnos. It is not surprising that the English-reading public should have had to wait so long: no one is likely to wish to read Nonnos as litera-

ture; those scholars who are curious about the influence of word-accent upon prosody have no need of anything but the text; those who consult him on matters connected with Greek religion and mythology are probably able (though perhaps not without pain) to cope with the Greek; and there will certainly be some who wonder why he should have been translated at all. No translation can free the reader from the infinite tediousness of a writer who spoils even the best of the stories which he tells by their excessive length, and his whole work by the constant repetition of the same tasteless conceits, by his innumerable digressions, and by his

capacity for turning what might be pretty or even beautiful, no less than what might be made impressive, into something which is merely grotesque or at worst disgusting. As Professor Rose says in his introductory article, 'he gives us neither living figures nor even a gallery of pleasing portraits or statues, but rather a faded and overcrowded tapestry, moving a little now and then as the breath of his sickly and unwholesome fancy stirs it.' One need only compare Nonnos' treatment of the battle of Zeus and Typhoeus with Milton's description of the War in Heaven to feel to the full the difference between the worst and the best that can be made of such a theme. It is very rarely indeed that a passage 'comes off'—for instance in Book III parts of the description of the palace of Electra; in Book V some part of the account of the wedding feast of Cadmus and Harmonia (especially of the dancing); in Book X, 280 ff., part of the lament for Ampelos, and a few other passages. As for the hero of the poem (who is not born till the Ninth Book), I need only quote Professor Rose again: 'His Dionysos is an utterly detestable character, or would be if it were possible to believe in him for one moment.' Nevertheless, Dr. Rouse may have done some service if he enables a reader who wants to discover what light Nonnos may throw on some obscure problem of mythology or religion to skim rapidly the pages of his English version instead of labouring through the tiresome and (owing to its vocabulary) often difficult Greek, and for this he deserves our thanks.

The mythological introduction and notes contributed by Professor Rose and quoted above add greatly to the value of the volumes, and his brief excursions on astronomical matters (explaining and correcting the author's thoroughly bad astronomy) were well worth writing. (Dare I suggest that he may have made a slip on p. xix, in speaking of Aion as a late personification? What of Heraclitus' *Αἰών πᾶς πεσοεύων παθός ἡ βασιλητή?*) Dr. L. R. Lind, an American scholar who has written a good deal about Nonnos in *Classical Philology* and

other periodicals, contributes a valuable introduction on the text of the author, with a compendium of emendations proposed since Ludwich's Teubner edition (1911), and a useful bibliography.

Dr. Rouse's translation is certainly much more readable than the original. It is inevitable that there should be some degree of artificiality in the style. (Andrew Lang is said to have stated that when he and Butcher were experimenting in styles for the prose translation of Homer they finally settled down to a far-away imitation of the Book of Mormon; and if Homer could only so be rendered, much less could so artificial a writer as Nonnos be represented in a simple and natural style.) But Dr. Rouse's artificiality is in some respects of a rather tiresome kind. The substance of his work is indeed straightforward, if not specially distinguished, English of the present day, but it is patched with mannerisms which seem to have their origin partly in Wardour Street, partly in colloquial language foreign to epic narrative, partly in some queer affectation of the translator. Whatever their origins, they spoil the consistency of the style and appear as irregularities in the inoffensive general texture. Here are a few instances out of very many:

(1) Pseudo-antiques: ii. 26 'the fire-shotten gleam' (*ξαφλεγές σέλας*), cf. iv. 14 'a sevennookshotten chamber' (*έπταμύχον θαλάμου*); v. 262 'to meadows and ealings' (*εἰς ἔλος, εἰς λειμῶνα*); x. 113, 'Danae in her hutch' (*λάρνακα*); xii. 16 'tripping round' (*ιπτάμεναι*), cf. 147 'tripping fingers' (*ἐντροχάλου παλάμης*); xiii. 486 'in chains of glammery' (*σοφῷ δεσμῷ*); xxxiii. 299 'maidenhead' (but in 354 and 380 'maidenhood'); and why the spelling of *hoboy* and *flotist* in a context of modern English? and why should *λυκάβας* always be translated 'lichtgang', which, if the *O.E.D.* can be trusted, is not English at all?

(2) Colloquialisms: i. 344 'So much for Hera' (*ἡ μέν ἔφη*); ii. 462 'there was no mistake about it' (apparently renders *μάρτυρι κατηώ*); xiv. 401 'shooed off a tribe of enemies' (*εσσενε*); xxi. 135 'let us burn all this stuff' (*δόλον φυτόν*); xxii.

45 'birds squawked an image of human speech' (*ἀνέκλαγον*).

(3) Mixtures of (1) and (2): v. 260 'scrouged out the rich feason' (*πίονας ὑποτόκου γονάς ἔθλιψεν ἐλαῖης*); iii. 26 'the players' hands skipt along the riddled run of the tootling pipe' (*ἐκ δὲ πολυτρίτοι πόρου σκυρτίματι χειρῶν*).

(4) A persistent mannerism is the translator's treatment of those compound epithets, so natural to Greek, which it has almost always been found better to render into English by a phrase rather than by an invented English compound. The standing epithets of gods and heroes Dr. Rouse often treats as independent proper names—Seabluehair (*κνανοχαίτης*), Flashthunderbolt (*ἀργυκέραυνη*), Goldilocks Deo (*Ἀργῆς ξανθοκόμου*), Dionysos Tapster (*οἰνοχύτου Διονύσου*), Brighteyes (*γλαυκῶπις*), and so on. Other compounds are given very odd equivalents, e.g. i. 60 'Seabluehair marvelled at the waddlefoot voyage' (*πλόον εἰλιπόδην*) of Zeus with Europa; i. 156 'his row of rumble-rattling throats' (*βαρυσμαράγων στίχα λαυκῶν*); i. 181 'that midnipple star of Olympus' (*μεσόμφαλον ἀστρον* *Ολύμπου*); viii. 220 'quickshoe Hermes' (*ώκυπέδιλος*) cf. xiii. 541 'his heavyknee father' (*βαρύγονον*) and xxxiii. 2 'rushed off kneequick' (*ταχύγονος*); viii. 178 'the shieldbeswingled cave' (*σακέσπαλον ἄντρον*), cf. xiv. 34 'shake-a-shield Idaios' (*σακέσπαλος*); xi. 302 'the love-rattle Bassarids' (*φιλοκροτάλοι*), cf. xiii. 37 'her loverattle timbrel' (*φιλοσμαράγοιο*); xi. 517 'the neatswilling winepress' (*φιλακρήτῳ παρὰ ληνῷ*); xii. 22 'the fruit-pining autumn' (*φθινοτωρίδος*) and 24 'winemother grape' (*οἰνοτόκον βότρυν*); xii. 176 'the healtrouble flower' (*νήδυμον ἄνθος*); xiii. 2 'wakethefray Dionysos' (*ἐγερσμόθῳ*); xiii. 145 'flash-helm Meilisseus' (*κορυθαῖολος*) and 309 'longshot Achates' (*έκτιβολος*).

But whatever be thought of the style of Dr. Rouse's translation, his work cannot as a rule be charged with serious inaccuracy, and where (as continually happens) the impossibility of rendering Nonnos at all literally forces him to paraphrase rather freely, the paraphrasing is usually done with skill, and

it is only rarely that any idea in the original is left unrepresented. One or two notes made in passing may be worth setting down. The flower *άκανθος* is said (p. 98) to be 'perhaps an iris or a fritillary', and in xi. 261 we find 'scoring upon the iris-leaves the word Alas'. But it seems fairly certain (though it would take too long to argue the point here) that the flower with the letters inscribed on it was a gladiolus, and that the letters in any case were on the petals, not on the leaves. In ii. 620 *εἰζον ἐπουρανίου πεδούρεφές* 'Clodhopper' misses the point. It should be 'Son of Earth'. In ix. 192 *κύκλα χαλινοῦ* 'the flowing reins' is perhaps wrong; *κύκλα* may mean that the slack of the reins was gathered in a loop round his hand. In xi. 304 *οὐδ'* is not 'not even for a corpse', but is simply continuative, 'nor'. In xiii. 8 *ἐρεσομένων πτερύγων ἀνεμάδει ριπῇ* 'she paddled her way with wind-swift beat of wings' is surely wrong: no *paddling* is windswift. (There is a similar absurdity in xiv. 4.) In xiv. 226 *φιλομειδῆς δὲ γεραή*, translated 'that grinning old gammer', overlooks the fact that *φιλομειδῆς* was a stock epithet of Aphrodite and probably had no unpleasant significance. In xxi. 252 *οὐ μάθεν οὐρανίων μακάρων χορόν* the translation 'has learned no dances of the eternal Blessed', difficult in any case, is rendered very improbable by *χορόν* in the next line in its frequent sense of 'company'. In xxxiii. 7 *χυτὰς ὠδῖνας ἐλαῖον*, 'flowing juice' misses the metaphor.

But when the third volume appears, Dr. Rouse will have completed a long and difficult task, and we must not be ungrateful for it.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

THE third volume reached me some weeks after my notice of the first two had been sent in. While I have read it with care and interest, I do not think that it needs a separate notice of any length. The general characteristics of the translator's work are the same as they were in his translation of the earlier books, and there is no point in giving fresh illustrations of these; but the style

is perhaps more consistent and less sprinkled with oddities; it is very readable, and where the work becomes wearisome the fault is not with the translator, who is frequently more lucid and generally more pleasing than his original. The last quarter of Nonnos' epic contains some of the more attractive episodes in his infinitely tedious work, and in Dr. Rouse's rendering some of these stories have considerable charm, though a

reader who looks across from the English to the Greek and expects something equal to (e.g.) Apollonius will be disappointed. As before, the notes are very useful and tell the reader not a little that he might have found it difficult to discover for himself. Dr. Rouse is to be congratulated on the completion of a task which will probably never need to be undertaken again.

A. W. P.-C.

### THE HYMNS

*Synesii Cyrenensis Hymni.* Nicolaus TERZAGHI recensuit. Pp. xlviii+323. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1939. Paper, L.55.

TERZAGHI says that Synesius 'interdum verus perfectusque est poeta', which implies a restrained, but still perhaps excessive, admiration for his poetic powers. The present handsomely printed volume, which replaces T.'s 1915 edition, is dedicated to the late Augustine Fitz-Gerald, English translator of Synesius. T. provides an improved text, adding a critical apparatus compiled 'quam religiosissime' from his study of seventeen manuscripts. He has weighed each variant on its own merits, giving particular attention to metre, as well as style and meaning. At 1 (iii), 10 his emendation  $\tau'$  *āvauov* restores the metre; at 9 (i), 108 he chooses the variant  $\beta\alpha\pi\sigma$ , which is superior to the vulgate  $\beta\alpha\pi\sigma\tau$ ; and at 1 (iii), 460 he has good arguments for the reading  $\theta\epsilon\sigma\sigma$  (from Canter's margin), which removes the old puzzle of the many 'gods' supplicated by Synesius in the churches of Byzantium. These examples must suffice. Each page of text also contains useful references for the repetitions to which Synesius was addicted.

The lengthy commentary is written in Latin which has its quaintnesses but is usually clear. Its chief object is to show 'quid Synesius antiquioribus poetis, quid orphicis, quid gnosticis, quid neoplatonicis, quid magicis doctrinis debeat'. T. quotes extensively from the relevant literature, of which he has a wide knowledge. There are also close and most helpful analyses of the structure and meaning of the

### OF SYNEGIUS

hymns; here a special word of praise is due to the modesty and frankness, rare among commentators, with which T. points out difficulties which he cannot explain. One may well agree that many things in Synesius require 'non interpretis opus sed auguris aut haruspicis'.

T. has found manuscript authority for denying the tenth hymn to Synesius; it belongs to an unknown 'George the Sinner' ('γεωργὺλος ἀλιτροῖο'—the surname perhaps comes from v. 5). He arranges the other nine in the order observed by the  $\beta$  family; for there is no authority for the order in which they have been printed hitherto. He holds that  $\beta$  gives the order of the archetype and, further, that this is the order in which the hymns were written. Thus the first and second (iii, iv) were written before Synesius became a Christian; the third, fourth, and fifth (v, vi, ii) show closer contact with Christianity; the sixth, seventh, and eighth (vii, viii, ix) were written after Synesius had become 'perfectus Christianus'. The crux of this scheme is the ninth (i). In spite of a dissertation by M. Hawkins (to which T. refers in his addenda) its contents appear to be non-Christian; it is for this reason that earlier editors placed it first in the series. T.'s own notes show that they were largely, and perhaps completely, right in regarding it as akin to the first and second (iii, iv), which are full of neoplatonic, gnostic, and magical doctrine. Nevertheless T. holds that it was written by Synesius after he had become a Christian bishop. He may be right. But his arguments are not strong; he thinks e.g. that the reference to Teian and Lesbian poesy

in verses 2 and 3 means that this hymn is later than the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth; but those hymns certainly do not deal with the youthful charms (vv. 6 ff.) and earthly loves (v. 15) here associated with Teian and Lesbian strains. Nor is the general picture convincing; T. wavers between two explanations—the first, that Synesius never abandoned his youthful pantheistic speculations (p. 272), and the second, that 'as he grew old' he 'reverted' to them (p. 286). (But S. did not live long after reaching the age of forty, at which age he still felt young

according to T. on the difficult passage of the seventh (viii), 15 ff.) Other points deserving fuller consideration are (a) the argument based on ἐπιβαλλομένα as implying the commencement of a new task (1 = iii, 3, but cf. 130); (b) the explanation, which I do not understand, of 6 (vii) 1 (πρῶτος νόμον εὑρόμαν), where S., though clearly acquainted with the hymns of Gregory of Nazianzus, seems to claim to be the first Christian hymn-writer.

J. TATE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

### EIDOS AND IDEA

P. BROMMER: *EIDOS et IDEA*. Étude sémantique et chronologique des œuvres de Platon. *Philosophia Critica*, Deel I. Pp. 277. Assen: van Gorcum, 1940. Paper, fl. 4.90.

THE keystone of Platonism according to Brommer is the belief that in the act of knowledge the human mind makes immediate contact with reality. Against Natorp, the Platonic ideas are not to be interpreted as 'subjective' laws which the mind imposes on reality; rather it is reality which imposes them on us. Hence Brommer praises Plato's 'realism', which he regards as a remedy for the sophistic which is invading modern science. He himself, however, seems to shrink from reversing Kant's 'Copernican turn', and deliberately puts aside what is surely the crucial question, whether Plato was right in holding that knowledge is the meeting-ground of thought and things. As a remedy for sophistic his book is still less effective because he decries and misunderstands the part of dialectic. He thinks it is Plato's maturest doctrine that reality can be grasped by intuition without the help of dialectic, and his favourite reference is to *Epist.* vii. 342, which he takes to mean that the *λόγος* or definition ('necessary', according to Plato) is of no value in the scale of knowledge. Similarly he suggests that Plato reproached the Sophists not with lack of logic but with lack of intuition. But between rival intuitions dialectic

alone can decide, and Brommer sets too high a value on *δόξα* and too low a value on the 'cerebral logic' of the method of division, which he ascribes to the evil influence of Aristotle.

Brommer contends for a distinction between *ἰδέα* and *εἶδος*. The former is an 'image' in the mind, the latter is 'real structure' or form. The belief that the two can coincide is the mark of Platonism. But though the words tend to have an identical meaning, there is, he holds, always a difference 'at least of representation' even in such examples as *Euthyphro* 5 d, 6 d, and *Rep.* 596 ab (*ἰδέα κλίνης* and *εἶδος κλίνης*). Most of the book consists of a running commentary on passages considered relevant to this thesis. Plato's doctrine of *εἶδος* arose, we are told, by combining the innate morality (the element of *ἰδέα*) of Socrates with the innate geometry of Pythagoreanism, which stressed the mathematical structure of reality. But on the meaning of the word there is much wavering: it is an essence, it is real, and not an abstraction, yet it is not a substance; it is transcendent as well as immanent, but yet it is not separate from particulars; it is form, and yet it is related to *ἰδέα* (in the mind of man or of God) as content to form; and so on. Then it is suddenly announced that it is number; but this is followed by the statement that *εἶδος* or structure is the number (harmony or proportion) in which structure manifests

itself. It will be seen that Brommer progressively exaggerates the alleged distinction between *ἰδέα* and *εἶδος*, and that his argument is in danger of being lost in a maze of subtleties.

In all possible, and some impossible, places, Brommer insists on translating *εἶδος* as 'structure', giving, e.g., 'structure causale' for *τῆς αἰτίας τὸ εἶδος* (which must mean 'kind of causality') at *Phaedo* 100 b and 'two structures of war' for *εἴδη δύο πολέμου* at *Laws* 629 c. He contends that even when Plato uses *εἶδος* in its ordinary sense it always implies a principle of formation. It would seem that he has overlooked, e.g., *Rep.* 597 b 14 (*τρισὶν εἴδεσι κλινῶν*).

Brommer holds that Plato was continually rewriting his dialogues, and he claims to be able to distinguish earlier from later strata of doctrine in the same work. The concluding portion of the *Phaedo*, which mentions *λόγοι* as intermediaries between the mind and reality, is a 'later addition' because earlier in

the dialogue the mind lays hold on reality directly. (The assumption that the function of an intermediary is to keep things separate—that a bridge is for holding the banks of the river apart—betrays once more Brommer's own philosophic affiliations.) It is hardly necessary to reply that increasing complexity or profundity in the course of a dialogue is no proof of a later addition or revision, or to point out that on the hypothesis of constant 'rehandling' the problem of the chronology of the dialogues becomes utterly insoluble. Brommer adds that he will not argue in detail for his view of the *Phaedrus* as the earliest dialogue because this is an archaeological task of little philosophic interest. He should have altogether omitted such chronological speculations, which are the weakest part of a very uneven work.

J. TATE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

### THE POETICS FOR ENGLISH READERS

Aristotle's *Art of Poetry*: a Greek view of poetry and drama, with an introduction and explanations by W. Hamilton FYFE. Pp. xxxii+82. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Cloth, 6s. net.

THIS volume consists of a reprint (with a few alterations and the omission of ch. xx) of Bywater's translation, with an introduction and 'explanatory interchapters' (consisting of summaries and brief explanations or illustrations) and some footnotes. It is intended for readers who know no Greek. My own experience in reading the *Poetics* in Bywater's version with candidates taking 'Greek in English' for Pass Moderations many years ago suggests that the notes might well have been more numerous and full, but perhaps the Principal of Aberdeen has better-informed readers in view.

I have noticed about two dozen places in which Bywater's translation has been altered. In most of them the change is trivial and perhaps unnecessary. In a few it is definitely for the better (e.g. in

the renderings of *μέγεθος ἔχοντος* in ch. vi, *ἐκ περιπετείας* in ch. xvi, *προσθεῖναι* in ch. xxiv, *ῶς εἰρηκότος ὅ τι δοκεῖ* in ch. xxv). On the other hand, though Bywater's translation of *τῶν ἔξαρχόντων τὸν διθύραμψον* 'the authors of the dithyramb' must be wrong, the Principal's 'the *prelude* to the Dithyramb' is inadequate. The other uses of *ἔξαρχειν* show that more than a prelude is involved. (I have dealt with this at length in *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*.) In ch. vi, *τὸ τέλος πρᾶξις ἐστι*, 'the end aimed at' is less precise and accurate than Bywater's 'the end for which we live'. The *τέλος* in this clause is certainly *εὐδαιμονία*, not 'the end at which the dramatist aims'; the application to tragedy begins later (*οὐκονν ὅπως κτλ.*).

In the introduction and notes the following points call for comment:

(P. ix.) Stagira is now generally identified not with Stavros but with Nisvoro, about ten miles south of Stavros. I doubt whether Aristotle's life from 347 to 342 B.C. at Assos and Mitylene can be summarized as 'five

years of travel and teaching'. The question of his relations with Hermeias during this period is a much disputed one, but what seems fairly certain is that his zoological studies belong to this time, and I do not see much evidence of teaching.

(P. x.) What is the ground for the conjecture that Alexander owed a debt to his tutor 'in the science of his strategy'?

(P. xi and p. 43.) *έξωτερικοί λόγοι* are taken to be published or 'popular' writings. Whatever may have been the use of the words in later writers, Diels, Burnet, and others seem to be right in maintaining that, as used by Aristotle himself, the words refer to works by authors who were *έξω*, i.e. not of Aristotle's own school, probably contemporary Academicians. Aristotle does not himself use *έξωτερικός* at all, as seems to be implied on p. xi.

(Pp. xvii ff. and p. 15.) The treatment of *κάθαρσις* appears to accept the accuracy of this view of the function of tragedy. The Athenians 'took their purge at regular intervals to keep their emotions in good working order.' Are we really to suppose that pity and fear (or the tendencies towards them) were constantly accumulating in the mind of the average Athenian, that real life afforded no sufficient opportunities of indulging them, and that they rolled up inside him until the theatre season, when he discharged them on Orestes and Niobe? Or that the 'pleasure' arising from tragedy is simply the result of the discharge of noxious humours, and that tragedy has no positive function? The view of the effect of tragedy as a *κάθαρσις*, though Aristotle undoubtedly held it, seems in fact to be hopelessly inadequate.

(P. xxiv.) It is very doubtful whether the *κόθορνοι* of the actors of the Classical period were 'high-stilted boots'.

(P. xxvi and p. 33.) There should surely be some indication of the fact that many scholars think that the text of ch. xiv, in which 'he unexpectedly

awards the prize to the plot in which at the eleventh hour a fortunate discovery averts the irrevocable act of violence', has been disturbed or corrupted.

(P. xxxi.) 'Of inspiration . . . Aristotle never says a word.' What of *Rhet.* III. vii, *ἐνθεον γὰρ ή ποίησις?* Even in *Poet.* xvii δὸς *εὐθυνοῦς ή ποιητική ἔστιν ή μανικοῦ* (in view of the associations of *μανία*) implies the same idea.

(P. 1, 2.) The treatment of 'imitation' here seems rather superficial and gives no hint of the difficulties raised by Aristotle's theory. Nor does it seem to be true that 'realism' in the sense of 'an exact reproduction of visible objects' was 'not then born'. What of Zeuxis and Apelles?

(P. 3, n. 1.) I can find no evidence that originally the dithyramb was 'probably sung as a solo'. The first mention of it is in Archilochus, where a chorus with *έξάρχων* is implied.

(P. 6, n. 3.) There is no evidence to show whether the *Cyclops* of Timotheus was a nome or a dithyramb.

(P. 8, n. 1.) Of the four works to which the reader is referred for 'a full treatment of the origins of Tragedy and Comedy' two are in many points out of date, and one is (to say the least) very eccentric. The account given in the fourth is far from 'full'.

(P. 26, n. 2.) 'Agathon was Euripides' most successful rival.' What of Sophocles? The number of Agathon's successes is not recorded. 'Most original' might have been truer.

(P. 38, n. 3.) 'The Thorn-struck Ulysses' is not the right translation of *'Οδυσσεὺς ἀκανθοπλήξ*. Odysseus was wounded with the *ἀκανθα* or *κέντρον* (spine or pointed bone) of the *τρυγών* (probably the Sting-ray).

(P. 52, n.) The portion of Niobe's story which Aeschylus dramatized is at least partly known. (See *Greek Poetry and Life*, pp. 106 ff.)

(P. 61, n. 3.) 'The sea shores croak.' The Greek is *κράζουσιν*, not *κρώζουσιν*. The two sounds are quite different.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

## THE BEGINNINGS OF BOTANY

Reinhold STRÖMBERG: *Theophrastea. Studien zur botanischen Begriffsbildung.* (Göteborgs K. Vet. och Vitt. Samh. Handlingar, (5) Ser. A., VI. Nr. 4.) Pp. 234. Göteborg: Elander, 1937. Paper.

It is just a hundred years since the last part of Sibthorpe's *Flora Graeca* appeared; and the interest in Greek botany which that magnificent book aroused had long died down, till it was awakened or half-awakened again by Sir Arthur Hort's edition of the *Historia Plantarum*. Nowadays not a few of us, scholars or no scholars, have caught a glimpse of the Greek country-side when its spring flowers are at their loveliest, and have felt their fascination as Samuel Atchley did; but we seldom read Theophrastus, and the great name of Aristotle makes the *Historia Animalium* loom far larger than the *History* and the *Causes of Plants*. Nevertheless, these two are very great books indeed, and they played a greater part than ever Aristotle did in the renaissance of natural science. The *Historia Plantarum* was taken over, to all intents and purposes bodily, by the makers of modern botany; and we read the book almost as if it were written yesterday.

Dr. Strömberg's book is stiff reading; few will read it, but here and there the special student of Theophrastus will be grateful for it. The author is fond of small details. He explains the fine shades of meaning of common words, such as *καυλός*, *ράβδος*, *ξύλον*. He dwells on the special significance of such technical terms as *ἰσ* and *φλέψ*; and that there are pitfalls in the interpretation of these latter we know, even from the

*Timaeus*. He is interested, and properly interested, in Theophrastus' own fondness for long words and his habit of coining them: words like *ἐπικαυλόφυλλος*, *προσιζόφυλλος*, *ἐναγγειόσπερμος*, and the like—a habit not unknown among the botanists of to-day. He expatiates on both 'Wortreichthum' and 'Wortarmut' in Theophrastus' descriptions and nomenclature; and there is, alas, a touch of pedantry in his account of his own 'semasiologischen und onomasiologischen Einzelresultate'. I find him a little hard to follow, sometimes, in his reasoning. The Greeks had many words for pigeon, but a fowl was either mere *ὄπος*, or *ἀλεκτόρις*. From this, according to Dr. Strömberg, it is plain that they had rather have a pigeon than a —hen: 'beweist das sicher, dass sie die schönere Taube lieber hätten'. But the argument seems unsound; and I can imagine other reasons why pigeon, dove, and turtle had divers names.

But Dr. Strömberg is keenly alive to more important things. He has a good deal to say, and says it extremely well, about Theophrastus' insight into what we still speak of as a 'type'; and of his method *ὡς τύπῳ λαβεῖν*, which Speusippus thoroughly understood, which Aristotle hardly used and never emphasized, and which lies at the root and heart of systematic botany and zoology. He not only knows his Greek, but has enviable first-hand knowledge of the flora of Greece and Asia Minor; and he adds a copious and very useful bibliography to his book.

D'ARCY WENTWORTH THOMPSON.

*University of St. Andrews.*

## PLOTINUS ON THE INTELLIGIBLE UNIVERSE

A. H. ARMSTRONG: *The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus.* Pp. xii+126. Cambridge: University Press, 1940. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

In this sixth volume of *Cambridge Classical Studies* Mr. Armstrong discusses the three hypostases of Plotinus'

intelligible world with particular reference to their historical antecedents, and submits them to a searching philosophical criticism. He argues that one of the reasons why the Plotinian system will not work is that its author took over from various sources doctrines so inherently inconsistent that neither he

nor anybody else could weld them into a truly coherent whole. A good deal of work has been done recently on the sources of Plotinian teaching by Bréhier, Dodds, Witt, Armstrong himself, and others, and the summaries and discussions of this work are an important feature of the book. To take an illustration of Armstrong's method, he distinguishes between a 'positive' and a 'negative' aspect of the Plotinian One. Positively, the One is 'beyond Being' in the sense that it is higher than any Being which we know; it is absolute *ένεργεια*, loving and willing itself, and (Armstrong adds) therefore an *οὐσία*, something to which predicates can be applied—a conclusion against which Plotinus would no doubt have vigorously protested, but in vain, for there is no doubt that he sometimes fails to maintain a clear distinction between *νοῦς*, which he describes as *ἐν ὅ*, and *τὸ ἐν*. (Armstrong cites vi. 4 and 5 as treatises in which *νοῦς* and *τὸ ἐν* tend to be confused, but it seems fairer to say that in them *τὸ ἐν* is consistently neglected; see among other passages vi. 4. 2 *τὸ μὲν οὐν ὄντως πᾶν* (= *ἐν ὅ*) *ἐν οὐδενὶ ἔστιν οὐδὲν γάρ ἔστι πρὸ αὐτοῦ*. Plotinus would have said that the presence of matter in *νοῦς*, intelligible matter of course, infallibly distinguishes it from *τὸ ἐν*.) This 'positive' conception of the One is shown to come from *Republic* vi, through Aristotle's Active *νοῦς*, Numenius, Albinus, &c. Negatively regarded, the One is a bare unpredicable, unthinkable unity, a conception in harmony with the curious psychology of the mystical state, but, dialectically considered, owing much to the first hypothesis of the *Parmenides* (as Professor Dodds has shown), to Pythagorean mathematics, and something perhaps to Speusippus. Confusion between these two points of view undoubtedly led Plotinus into inconsistent utterances about the One.

For the 'un-Hellenic spirit of devotion' in Plotinus Armstrong does not think it necessary to look further than 'that stream of intense religious feeling from the East which makes its first entry into the Graeco-Roman world with

Stoicism', with a possible contribution from the solar theology so popular in Plotinus' time. As sources for the doctrine of the expansion of the Self into an Infinite Subject, i.e. the human self expanding into the plenitude of *νοῦς*, Armstrong proposes, besides Aristotle, Stoic or 'Posidonian' teaching, and he is very doubtful about Bréhier's theory of Indian influence.

Plotinus' characteristic doctrine of emanation was of course suggested by the radiation of light from the sun, and Armstrong thinks that he is possibly following Hermetic teaching when he gives light 'a very special status', and thereby comes dangerously near confusing spirit with matter. The conception of *νοῦς*, *ψυχή*, and the sensible world as a necessary outflow from the Supreme Principle, which is only interested in itself and can take no interest in its products, has often been criticized; nor does Plotinus carry conviction when he attributes the origin of the Intelligible World to an 'incurable multiplicity' in *νοῦς*, which renders it incapable of apprehending the One in its unity—a view for which Armstrong finds a parallel in Philo. One of the most striking features of the Plotinian *νοῦς* is that it is a 'World of Ideas, themselves living and intelligent', and one would like to know more than Armstrong has to tell us of the historical process by which this came about.

While Plotinus insists that there are three and only three intelligible hypostases, Armstrong shows that he is not always faithful to his own doctrine and tends, like others of his age, to multiply entities. Thus *φύσις*, the lower embodied soul, is sometimes treated as a hypostasis distinct from the higher *ψυχή*, and in iii. 2 and 3 *λόγος* discharges the functions assigned to *ψυχή* in other treatises. Indeed Plotinus alters his intelligible series to suit his immediate purpose. In vi. 6 (a treatise not referred to by Armstrong) we find the sequence *τὸ πρῶτον*, *ὅν*, *νοῦς*, *ζῶον*, where *ὅν* is definitely prior to *νοῦς*, though usually co-ordinate with it.

The reviewer believes that every student of Plotinus will be as grateful for

this excellent study as he is himself. If the reader finds the critical note somewhat severe, he will at least agree with Armstrong's concluding estimate of Plotinus as 'one of the few ancient philosophers whom we can still honour

... as a master, and not simply study as a historical curiosity'.

J. H. SLEEMAN.

*Royal Holloway College,  
Englefield Green.*

### JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

*Selections from St. John Chrysostom.*

The Greek Text edited with Introduction and Commentary by the Right Rev. J. F. D'ALTON, D.D., D.Litt. Pp. viii+395. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1940. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

ANNOTATED editions of patristic texts are still lamentably few, and the present work is calculated to meet a need, if not a felt want. First comes an introduction (38 pp.) on Chrysostom's life and writings. Then follow the extracts, distributed through twelve chapters, each of which opens with a full special introduction and closes with notes which, though short, are numerous and contain many references to other authorities.

The selections, the text of which has unfortunately had to be based in the main on the bad Benedictine edition, will serve well to introduce students to Chrysostom. Not but what one could wish Dr. D'Alton had found room for more. Justice is hardly done by p. 242, 2 ff., *al.* to the earnest preacher of hell-fire or by p. 376, 1 ff., *al.* to the insistent advocate of Bible-reading, or even by the extracts in ch. vii to the difficulties of ministering to Christian flocks who had to be bidden approach the dread mystery of the Lord's Table *μὴ θορυβοῦντες μηδὲ λακτίζοντες μηδὲ ὠθοῦντες τοὺς πληρούντας*. And there is little or nothing to illustrate Chrysostom's attitude to heretics and Jews.

The special value of the edition perhaps lies in the general and special introductions, which reveal a close acquaintance with the circumstances of Chrysostom's life and times. But, except for a virtual taboo of grammar, there is usually an informative or explanatory note where one is wanted. The source of almost all Biblical quota-

tions and echoes is given and there is abundant classical illustration.

To turn to details. P. 74: *διωγμός* does not occur in Aesch. *P.V.* P. 98: what evidence is there that *τελετή* first acquired its mystic sense in the fifth century B.C.? P. 119: *προστάτης* in 111. 31 means 'champion', not 'ruler'. P. 145, 4: *ἐπ' ὄψεα* calls for a note. P. 156: is *ἀθυμίας* in 141. 6 not 'sadness' 'grief' (cf. 58. 1 *al.*)? P. 160: *δεδονημένα* 'their souls are in a whirl (of emotion)' confuses *δονεῖν* with *δυνεῖν*. P. 177. 27 *ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ δὲ* is a dubious combination of particles: and, if indeed *ὁ δὲ* has manuscript authority, we should probably read *ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅδε*. P. 203: Chrys. does not say in 208. 7 that Paul 'was ever docile to the commands of the other Apostles'. P. 213: 'recollection' is mystifying till emended to 'reflection'. P. 252: *κατορύττεσθαι* in 236. 3 perhaps gains less light from Lib. *Or. xlvi. 14* than from *In Matt. 443 c.*, L.S.J. p. 208<sup>1</sup>, Aristid. I. 414, Ov. *Her. 6. 144*, &c. P. 262: the arrangement of the note on *περιάπτα* is confusing, leaving it uncertain whether Chrys. condemns the custom, commonly practised by women and children, of wearing a portion of the Gospels suspended round the neck. P. 277. 22: *ἰμαρίους* can perhaps be justified by Eust. 1871. 49 f. (misquoted by L.S.J.), but certainly needs a note (it might conceivably be a corruption of *αἰμασιάς*). P. 284: *ὑπάτος* (cf. Lat. "summus") is the word commonly used by Polybius for "consul": why 'by Polybius'? P. 288: why should *βλαστήσαντες* in 281. 32 be attached to *βλαστέων*, which, unlike *βλαστάνω* and *βλαστάω*, seems never to be used transitively? P. 300. 29: *προσιέμεν* can hardly stand ('admitted' would be *προσιέμεθα*): the Benedictine version renders it by *accessimus*, which

would require *προσήγειν*. P. 304, 37: *ἐνορασ* needs a note. P. 327: does *ρύμη* ever mean 'quarter of a city'? P. 371. 24: *δύναντ* ἀν... ἀκροατάς *εἰναι*. P. 384: *τρικυμίαι* are 'triple waves', not 'third waves'. P. 388: *τὰ οτοιχεῖα* is perhaps the astronomical bodies only, cf. *In Gal.* 704 E, *In Col.* 365 F, *In Matt.* 579 E (741 c), Thdt. *H.E.* v. 39. 5 with Valesius' note.

Chrysostom's success in the literary crime of Atticism is overestimated in the statement (p. 33) that 'an occasional word or phrase or construction may

betray the fact that he was born in Asia and not in Attica, or that he belonged to a period of decline'.

It is regrettable that Dr. D'Alton has been so sparing in the indication of standard references as to make consultation of his notes a laborious business for anyone reading Chrysostom in another edition. The Greek type used is an improved form of Mr. Scholderer's, purged of  $\Delta$ , but not of decrusted  $\xi$ .

W. L. LORIMER.

University of St. Andrews.

#### THE LANGUAGE OF VIRGIL

A. CORDIER: (1) *Études sur le vocabulaire épique dans l'Énéide*; (2) *L'Allitération latine: le procédé dans l'Énéide de Virgile*. (1) Pp. xxxi+356; (2) xi+113. (1) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', (2) Paris: Vrin, 1939. Paper, 60 and 30 fr.

'COMPOUND words suit dithyrambs, rare words the epic, metaphors iambic verse; but epic also uses the compound and the metaphor.' Thus Aristotle, and Dr. Cordier uses these categories, which he, doubtless rightly, supposes to have been known to Virgil, except that he excludes metaphor, regarding it as belonging to style, not vocabulary. In this he is perhaps mistaken: Aristotle included under metaphor what was later distinguished as synecdoche (*Poetics* 1457<sup>b</sup>7), and this wide connotation of the word persisted alongside the more restricted one. Latin poetry became more and more cautious in the use of metaphor proper, but more and more attached to such practices as the use of *puppis* for *nauis*, *fons* for *aqua*. Many of these 'metaphors' became an element of vocabulary for the Latin poets, as much as 'poetic' and foreign words like *unda* and *polus*. In fact we find that Dr. Cordier unsuspectingly includes many of them in his lists (e.g. p. 136); but they deserved a separate treatment, which might show that Virgil stood out against a tendency to convert them into mere synonyms, used for metrical convenience or to avoid banality, although he did not always resist it (e.g. *alternos*

*longa nitentem cuspide gressus*, A. xii. 386).

Dr. Cordier's first chapter is devoted to archaisms, separated from other glosses, which he divides into poetic, rare, technical, and foreign words. There is no doubt that archaisms have a special importance in epic, yet it is not possible to distinguish the archaic word from the poetic word (cf. Cic. *De Orat.* iii. 153), and Dr. Cordier does not avoid overlapping. His statistical comparisons between Virgil and his predecessors are of little value for reasons many of which he himself gives, but he clearly demonstrates the greater unobtrusiveness of Virgil's procedure: Virgil is more fond of archaic words than of the more striking archaisms of form, of obsolete meanings than of obsolete words; his archaisms are taken from earlier poets and thus in a way familiar; he will even give them the same place in his verse as did his model. Also he does not scatter them at random but, like Lucretius, tends to concentrate them in passages of special elevation.

Passing to the other glosses, Dr. Cordier observes that Ennius made greater use of each kind in his epic than in his tragic writing,<sup>1</sup> and that their suitability for epic was thus established in the tradition of Roman poetry from the first. He then gives lists of the glosses used by Virgil's predecessors and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 'Ennio delector, ait quispiam, quod non discedit a communi more uerborum', Cic. *Orat.* 36. The context shows that tragedy is spoken of.

by Virgil himself in the *Aeneid*, followed by lists of those used or not used by most imaginable combinations of these authors. This method of arrangement makes a fat book, but a tabular survey would have been easier to understand or consult. Room might then have been found for an examination of the *Bucolics* and *Georgics* and of Virgil's contemporaries; their neglect has led to some mistakes, and in particular to the inclusion of too many words under the heading 'apparently invented by Virgil'. A. Ernout, *Rev. phil.* lxvi. 148, provides a valuable corrective and supplement here.

The final chapter, which treats compound words in the same repetitive way, makes it clear that Virgil gave preference to those types of compound that were most natural to the Latin language.

Dr. Cordier has made a useful collection of material, and he has not failed to point out how Virgil uses his epic vocabulary as a means to very varied poetical effects. His book should be of use to future researchers, provided that they check his lists, and do not argue from his silence; for example *ilicet* is overlooked; *capiti* (vii. 689) and *silici* (i. 174) are not pseudo-archaic ablatives, but the datives that they seem: *aureus*, *nutrix*, *taurinus*, and many others can

hardly be called 'poetic' words, or *nauigium*, *mortales*, *elephantus* (iii. 464), *rediuius* 'poetic synonyms' for *nauis*, *homines*, *Luca bos*, *rediuius*.

Dr. Cordier's minor work, on Virgilian alliteration, contains few observations that will be new to those who practise the writing of hexameters. One that is new is also false: the statement that *olle* is always 'an alliterating element' is disproved by fourteen passages. I add a few brief observations.

1. Dr. Cordier's account of what constitutes alliteration is neither sufficiently reasoned nor consistent.

2. Can any alliteration be set aside as 'accidental'? It is true that one cannot say 'my walls' in Latin without alliterating, but the poet may choose among all the ways of expressing his meaning the one that involves the phrase *mea moenia* in part because he thus obtains an alliteration, e.g.

*quid moror? an mea Pygmalion dum moenia frater.*

3. Should a distinction be made between alliteration involving stressed and unstressed syllables? One might expect the former to be the more striking.

Both books have good bibliographies and indexes.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

### THE EMOTION OF ELEGY

Erich REITZENSTEIN: *Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz*. Pp. 110. (Philologus, Supplementband XXIX, Heft 2.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. Paper, RM. 6 (bound, 7.50).

THE late Richard Reitzenstein's son Erich has written a competent essay on the relation between description and emotion in Propertius. He holds that Propertius is far the most subjective of all elegiac poets, and that many misunderstandings of his work are due to ignorance of that fact. He drives this home by a close examination of Arethusa's letter to her soldier husband (Prop. 4. 3), comparing it with Ovid's Laudamia letter (*Her.* 13). Ovid's poem is full of realistic quasi-heroic detail;

but Laudamia has no 'individual inward life', being merely a typical bereaved bride in overpoweringly epic surroundings, more real and important than she is herself. For Propertius, external detail is unimportant, except as it serves to illustrate Arethusa's emotions, which, although her surroundings are those of prosaic everyday life, rise to almost tragic greatness.

This contrast does not sound wholly convincing, and indeed Mr. Reitzenstein confuses his exposition by simultaneously trying to disprove Mermann's thesis that Propertius imitated the *Heroides*. But his subsequent analyses of more than a dozen of the most interesting elegies make his point both clear and credible. He draws

illuminating comparisons between Propertius' and Ovid's poems on their tablets (Prop. 3. 23; Ovid, *Am.* 1. 11 and 12) and on their successes in love (Prop. 2. 14 and 15; Ovid, *Am.* 1. 5 and 2. 12). Thus, Propertius begins 2. 15 with a cry of physical exultation, but moves on to reflection, which becomes ever more serious and spiritual till the end; Ovid 1. 5 is almost wholly physical detail, with only one flat, though sincere, reflection—*prouenant medii sic mihi saepe dies!* For the emotion which gives Propertius' elegies their peculiar charm is not a single mood, as in Ovid; it changes and develops throughout each poem. It is essential to feel the direction of these changes in every elegy, if we are to understand the poem as a whole.

#### PLINY'S NATURAL HISTORY IN THE LOEB LIBRARY

Pliny, *Natural History*, with an English translation by H. RACKHAM. Vol. III. *Libri VIII-XI.* Pp. x+616. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1940. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

UNPERTURBED by Pliny's higgledy-piggledy Latin, Mr. Rackham cheerfully labours on,<sup>1</sup> and he deserves generous credit for surmounting many difficulties. Yet, although no one (certainly not I myself) could hope to translate Pliny without mistakes, it must be sorrowfully recorded that here there are too many: a selection follows.

viii. 14 *stipes* are not 'branches'; 26 *intertos* = 'taut', not 'unbent'; 55 *non sine ostento quodam temporum* means 'a plain portent of the times' ('not without some intention of exhibiting the position of affairs', R.); 58, would the lion (not being Androcles' friend) 'hold out its foot' when the bone had stuck in its teeth?; 98 *apri* are not 'goats'; 105 *collum . . . in continuatatem spinae porrigitur* must mean 'its neck forms a continuous extension of the spine' (how could it 'stretch right along the backbone?'); 111 'and similarly' for *itaque* ruins the sense (the meaning is practically 'and then'; Mayhoff suggests *atque*); R. may be right in taking *praeri-*

Mr. Reitzenstein destroys, in his final chapter, a silly but ingenious article by Mr. Jachmann in *Rhein. Mus.* 1935 (on which see Dornseiff in *Hermes*, 1936). I found his whole essay stimulating and—though marred by some cruel torturing of untranslatable readings—largely true. But I was constantly deterred from reading it by its awkward arrangement, and by its author's unwillingness to disentangle polemic from exposition. In one appendix he answers an article by Knoche. If all his polemics had been grouped in appendices, the whole work would have gained in clarity and authority.

GILBERT HIGHET.

Columbia University, New York.

*pientis* here as genitive (cf. xxx. 89), but it is difficult—why not read *praeri-pientibus*?; 130 *colapho infractio*—R. forgets the idiom *colaphum infringere*; 157 *idem* refers to horses in general, not to the Sybarite breed; 191 *pingitur . . . pingunt*—R. gives 'darning' . . . 'dyeing': the verb cannot mean both, if it means either—and what reading is translated?

ix. 15 *adsultantibus* refers to ships 'bobbing about', not to whales (there was only one); 94, 'Dardanelles' for *Propontis*?; 104 *quis pretia capientium periculo fiunt* = 'which become luxuries at the cost of their captors' lives', cf. § 105 ('to which the profits made by those who catch them spell danger', R.); 106 *Indis* is dative of agent ('for the Indians' is absurd; see viii. 167 for the same mistake); 110, the subject of *praeveniat* is not *manus* but *concha*; 168 *Baiano* = 'his estate at Baiae', not 'the gulf of Baiae' (a like mistranslation in § 173).

x. 13 *excludunt* = 'hatch', not 'eject' (cf. ix. 163, 165); 40 *illi vero et supini* means 'but these climb upside down too', not 'but also the others that cling upside down'; 122 *aemulatione vicinitatis* = 'through jealousy of his neighbour' ('because of his neighbour's competition', R.); 124 *ut exeuntem sic comitarentur*, not 'followed him in this way

<sup>1</sup> Volume II has not yet come to me.

when he left the forest', but 'followed when he went out hunting like this'; 182 *dasyus et lepus*—why 'the common rabbit and the hairy-footed rabbit'?; 203, it is not the eagle, but the trochilus which 'rex appellatur avium', hence the enmity (R. has misunderstood *quoniam* here)—cf. Thompson's *Glossary of Greek Birds*, p. 289; a note is needed on Pliny's confusion in viii. 90.

xi. 2, R. still regards *culex* as a flea, in spite of its 'truculent voice' (he knows better in § 61); 6 *quae alia suis aestimabuntur locis* cannot mean 'and make other statements the value of which will be judged in their place' (rather '[despite] other characteristics which will be judged . . .'); 9, how can *tutius vere quam durius* possibly mean 'harder or rather more durable'? (the text is corrupt, but R.'s addition of *in* before *nervo* is surely impossible, as Pliny has just denied sinew to insects); 22 *ut alis intrent, aliis exeat*, not 'that some may come in and others go out', but 'that they may enter by one beeway and leave by another'; 78 *bombyce adhuc feminis cedimus* = 'we are not yet as bad as women in the matter of the *bombyx*' ('we leave the silk-moth to women', R.); 92 *sequens* means 'second', not 'subsequent'; 94 *in ventre, in the belly, not 'on' it*; 97, why Lucanian *oxen*?; 110 *quantulacumque adsiduitate*, not 'a trifling amount of assiduity', but 'the perseverance of ever such tiny creatures'; 125 *reducus* and *supinus* cannot be identical: the horns curve, I think, 'inward,' outward . . . upward, downward, spirally (?); 162 *concavi* obviously means 'hollow', not 'curved'; 193, in *id venenum esse serpentium*, the subject is *venenum*, the predicate *id* (R. reverses them, but cf. § 163); 244

*Sedigitum* is predicate, with *appellatum* understood—R. has quite misinterpreted the clause; 269 *gravior, exilior* = 'deeper, shriller', not 'louder, not so loud', and 'even' for *etiam* destroys the meaning.

By these and many other mistakes (where Bostock and Riley are often more accurate) Mr. Rackham does sad disservice to his own merits; they cause lively regret to temper gratitudo.

Thompson still seems ignored on birds (e.g. *Diomedeae aves* and others), so too Mair on fishes; reference to both might have interested the general reader. Fraser's *Beekeeping in Antiquity*, though not always accurate in its translations, yet would have been worth consulting and mentioning; on p. 54 mention might have been made of Shiple's chapter on the yale in *Cambridge Cameos*.

The text again embodies many of R.'s own conjectures, some not demonstrably necessary: note, however, viii. 26 *sagittarum vice*, 164 *equam, 208 renasse*, ix. 153 *eripiunt, 178 mirabilibus*, x. 8 *ausert, 92 in fetum, 11. 126 vinisque, 267 aper*. Some appear doubtful; cf. xi. 9 quoted above, xi. 26 *ipsis* for *ipst*; in x. 96, Thompson's proposal *galguli* should have been recorded (*Glossary*, p. 333).

This volume disgraces British book-production by containing nearly a hundred misprints. The text is riddled with execrable misspellings, including forms such as *cam, cos, cius, adhue*, and monstrosities like *imponicum* (for *impositum*), while the English contains such absurdities as 'offsprings' for 'offerings' and 'mares' for 'males' (translating *mares*); punctuation is often faulty. Did no one read the proofs?

R. G. AUSTIN.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. L. J. D. Richardson, *Hermathena*, lv. 90 ff.

*University College, Cardiff.*

### THE STYLES OF JEROME AND LEO THE GREAT

(1) J. N. HIRZU: *The Style of the Letters of St. Jerome*. Pp. xii+121.  
 (2) W. J. HALLIWELL: *The Style of Pope St. Leo the Great*. Pp. xvi+98. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1939. Paper, \$2 each.  
 For those who like to estimate style by

means of statistics, here are two more volumes in the series of Patristic Studies published by the Catholic University of America. Both follow the procedure already laid down by predecessors in the series. For each figure we have a definition, then selected examples from

St. Jerome or St. Leo, then the total number of instances found in the subject of study. Finally, on the basis of this total a comparison is made with other authors who have already been similarly investigated.

I confess I am not enamoured of the general method. It takes more than an arithmetical key to unlock the secrets of style. For example, rather than be told that St. Jerome uses Metaphor 1,768 times in his Letters, I should prefer to know the spheres of activity or experience from which he derives his metaphors; also I should like the genuine creations of the author to be distinguished from 'faded' metaphors which have already become the current coin of the language, as well as from those which are merely echoes of Biblical phraseology. The total of 1,768 means little unless I know how many instances like *riovs sanguinis, scutum fidei, ignita diaboli iacula* have been included. In this respect Mr. Halliwell appears to be more critical. He claims to have excluded at least one faded metaphor from his total: but many of the examples quoted (e.g. *lumen veritatis, arbor habens poma*) smack strongly of Biblical origin.

Where we are asked to take totals largely on trust, our estimate of their validity must depend upon the character of the relatively small number of examples offered. Examples (from Mr. Hritzu) like '*Verumtamen dum vernum tempus adveniat*' and '*ne unum quidem nummum haberet*' for Parechesis, '*alterum pendet ex altero*' for Polyptoton, '*non nocere*' for Alliteration, are not very impressive. Mr. Halliwell's examples are somewhat less open to criticism. Yet is *huiusmodi homini-*

*bus* really an instance of Parechesis? When St. Leo wrote *acquievit blasphemis* and *canitatem senectutis*, was he consciously making use of Alliteration ('Initial-Interior')? Mr. Halliwell shows certainly on occasions a more healthy realization that different readers may take different views about the character of certain expressions. He says that the 'subjectivity' of judgements about Periphrasis renders any comparison under this heading practically valueless. Mr. Hritzu shows no such hesitation in counting the instances in St. Jerome. He finds, however, the total comparatively low, and adds by way of explanation: 'the paucity of instances [of periphrasis] is due no doubt to the careful style of St. Jerome who is moderate in the use of rhetorical devices, especially in the use of periphrasis.'

There is apparently some disagreement among the authors of this series on the subject of 'Repetitive Paronomasia'. This is, according to Mr. Hritzu, a figure to which St. Jerome was particularly devoted: a typical example is '*licet mihi de larvis, de noctua, de bube, de Niliacis ridere portentis*'. Mr. Halliwell has no corresponding heading for St. Leo. We are left to conclude either that St. Leo abstained altogether from this type of expression (which is almost incredible), or that Mr. Halliwell considers such normalities of Latin usage unworthy of mathematical investigation. Or has he, perchance, included them under Epanaphora? Clearly the earnest inquirer, if he is to make any practical use of these totals, will want to know.

J. W. PIRIE.

*University of Glasgow.*

#### HELLÉNISTIC ARCHONS

William Bell DINSMOOR: *The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries*. Pp. xvi + 274. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, 30s.

IN 1931 Professor Dinsmoor published his great work *The Archons of Athens*, in which he put forward a new list of the Athenian archons of the Hellenistic period, and summed up the existing

work on the subject down to the beginning of the American excavation of the Agora. The present book takes account of eight years' work on the Agora; we now have sixteen more archon-names of the third and second centuries B.C. and much new information about the secretariat; but the vital matter, the tribe of the secretary of any of the third-century archons whose dates are fixed *aliunde*,

still eludes discovery. Dinsmoor now puts forward a revised archon-list; and the new book, which displays the same learning and ingenuity as its predecessor, is a most valuable summing-up of all the new material and work. Due regard is paid to Dow's discovery of the chronological bearing of the  $\epsilon\delta\delta\zeta\epsilon\nu$  clause, and the uselessness of the Metonic cycle as a means of dating is further demonstrated. As before, the ark of the covenant, to Dinsmoor, is 'Ferguson's law' of the rotation of the secretariat. Ferguson's later view, the possibility of the archons in any particular cycle being arranged not by rotation but by sortition, he almost declines to discuss; he says that 'if, whenever we find ourselves in a difficulty, we leave a gap for a sortition cycle, the problem will long await solution', which assumes that no solution is possible on any lines but his own. Following on this, he has a long examination of the priests of Asklepios, to get rid of Ferguson's sortition in the cycle 157/6-146/5; it is curious that he nevertheless accepts sortition for the priesthood of Hagne Aphrodite.

I can only indicate how a few of the main problems now stand. After Dinsmoor, and subsequently Ferguson, had accepted 288/7 for Diokles (fall of Demetrios), it did look as if this was at last a fixed point; I think Kolbe has been the sole remaining dissentient. Now Dinsmoor has gone back to 287/6, on very hypothetical grounds, a retrograde step in which I cannot believe. Xenophon at last returns to his obvious place as Diokles' predecessor, as I said in 1913. Meritt's date of 284/3 is accepted for the new Nikias. Dinsmoor retains his former dating, 281/0, for Gorgias; but 'ten years before' 271/0 (if that be the reading) must, to a Greek reading a literary text, have meant 280/79. On that great crux, Peithidemos (beginning of the Chremonidean war), he still argues for 270/69, and puts the death of Areus, for which 265 has long seemed certain, in 266 (it was the death of Areus which made Ferguson and Meritt retain Peithidemos in 267/6); this depends on a new theory of his own about the Olympic year, to which I have not access. His Chremoni-

dean War is a strange one, with Egypt and Sparta practising modern 'non-belligerency', and Antigonos fighting or not as it struck him; its one merit, which is not noticed, is that it starts 'Arsinoe's war' soon after her death. He brushes my reasons aside, since I 'disregard the secretary cycles', which 'is absolutely impossible'. Well and good, if he were consistent; but, apart from admitted breaks later, he himself has a break in the rotation between 247/6 and 246/5 (*below*), for which no historical reason can be given; why is this not 'absolutely impossible' also? There is a good argument for dating *I.G. ii.2* 477 (reconciliation of Athens and Antigonos) in 278/7 rather than in 261/0.

The Polyeuktos-Soteria problem is treated at exhaustive length, with a clear exposition of its history; incidentally the third-century Delphic archon-list is re-examined throughout. He assigns Polyeuktos to 248/7, while admitting there are arguments for the now usual 243/2. For the much-scrutinized letter in *I.G. ii.2* 791 he accepts *A*, thus breaking the rotation in 246; he rejects *A* on unpublished evidence of Meritt's. The Sotion vase is dated 212, which he still argues was Philopator's ninth year (his note 81 on p. 124 is a misapprehension, for there was no 'Syrian war of 214'); the latest examination, which is not noticed, makes Philopator's ninth year 16 Oct. 214 to 14 Oct. 213 (T. C. Skeat, *Mizraim*, vi, 1937, p. 7). Dinsmoor dates the annual Soteria 263-257, and argues that the quadrennial Soteria can be better arranged from 248/7 than from 243/2, it being assumed that we know them *all*. For the Phthia problem, pp. 155-6, see my forthcoming *Phthia-Chryseis*. The creation of Ptolemais is put in 226/5 (Ergocharies). In the second century he returns to Ferguson's scheme, with some adjustments and filling of gaps; new evidence supports the literary tradition that Pydna was fought on 22 June. His revised date for Hipparchos' reform of the calendar is either 154 or 135. Readers must not miss the delightful dedication.

W. W. TARN.

## PLATO ON SLAVERY

Glenn R. MORROW: *Plato's Law of Slavery in its Relation to Greek Law*. Pp. 140. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, XXV, No. 3.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1939. Paper, \$1.50.

A THOROUGH study of Plato's *Laws* in relation to Greek positive law is a task that is still to be accomplished. Much has, however, been done in special branches; and Mr. Morrow has now added to this by his useful book on the law of slavery. One of the difficulties of such a study—of which Morrow is well aware—is the inadequacy of our knowledge of Greek law; another, peculiar to the study of one branch only (especially that of slavery), is that Plato nowhere gives a systematic account either of his principles or of his regulations, which are scattered through several books, and there are many lacunae, as Morrow frequently shows. To explain this, we have to keep the whole work constantly in mind; the lacunae, for example, are partly at least to be explained by the fact that the slave was a member of the family, and Plato thought that right conduct within the family was dependent more on moral principles than on legal sanctions (as indeed he would have liked all right conduct to be, in an ideal state, which is why he wished all his laws to be educative rather than restrictive: a paradox in a book which has so many and minute restrictive regulations as the *Laws*). Morrow's own analysis is systematic: he is good on the fundamental law of slavery, against the legalistic views of Beauchet and Lipsius, and, still more, Kahrstedt's; his subsequent chapters deal with the protection of the slave's person, the offences of slaves, the legal capacity of slaves, the inheritance of slave status, emancipation, and the determination of slave status. In general, his argument is sound and his statement clear (though important matters of principle sometimes appear as an afterthought in footnotes). In many particulars, however, his judgement is weak, often

through lacking a sense of reality: Phormio was not 'charged with *hybris* for presuming to marry Pasion's widow' (Dem. xlv. 4); 'the curious case of Legg. viii. 845 c, reminiscent of Sparta, which prescribes flogging for a citizen under thirty who is *caught* stealing fruit' is wholly misunderstood (England's note is on the right lines); Dem. lix. 9 is not at all 'difficult to explain', even though slaves were competent witnesses in a homicide case; it is naïve to argue from Dem. xxii. 61 that the distinction between slave and freedman was slight; we cannot say that Plato permitted emancipation as an incentive to good conduct, 'but that having permitted it, he was determined that it should be so defined and regulated as to differ but little in fact from the state of slavery', —for then there would be no incentive. The chapter on manumission is the weakest, both for Plato and for Attic law: the Attic and Delphic inscriptions are lumped together as though they belonged to the same time and place, and Morrow can actually say (in his text: he modifies this slightly in a later footnote), 'there was no requirement of publicity at Athens till a later century'; and can suppose that in Athens there were the same restrictions on the freedman as were usual at Delphi, but that these restrictions were not published with the manumission record: what would be the value of the record? There are other instances of misunderstanding: the State did not 'permit' prosecution for homicide by the next-of-kin, it enjoined it; there is no inconsistency between Legg. 854 a, 857 b, and 942 a, though perhaps a lack of lucidity; 954 e ἀτελῆ καὶ ἀκυρον γίγνεσθαι τὴν δίκην means not 'the suit will be dismissed', but 'the trial (already held) shall be null and void', and Morrow's difficulties are largely imaginary; 'at Athens it seems to have been the law that whoever proposed such a measure [for the admission of a slave or freedman to citizenship] was liable to prosecution (i.e. to the γραφὴ παρανόμων)', is a misunderstanding of 'Αθην. 40. 2; nor is

Isocrates xii. 97 evidence that *ἀφαιρεῖσθαι* *eis ἀλευθερίαν* of *de facto* slaves was illegal—it is not good evidence either way.

For all that, Mr. Morrow has given us a most useful discussion of the problem, with plentiful references to ancient and modern authorities. It is, however,

surprising to find in his bibliography no volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum* later than *C.I.A.* 1873-97 and *C.I.G.* 1828-77, and no mention of Taylor's translation of the *Laws*.

A. W. GOMME.

*University of Glasgow.*

### CALABRIA

Gertrude SLAUGHTER: *Calabria the First Italy*. Pp. xiv+330; 53 illustrations, maps. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1939. Cloth, \$4.

MRS. SLAUGHTER's title is well chosen to indicate both her subject and her particular approach to it: her Calabria is the modern province, the toe of Italy, the only part of the great Italian peninsula to which the name Italy is applied by early Greek historians, and this first Italy contains most of the cities of Magna Graecia. She first visited the province with Italian friends to attend the opening of a new school in a remote mountain village, and it was this humanitarian errand, she tells us, that led to further exploration of Calabria, in the course of which she visited the museums and ancient sites of the region and made the acquaintance of local historians and archaeologists. She acknowledges a special debt to Dr. Umberto Zanotti-Bianco, whose reports on archaeological work in Magna Graecia and Sicily will be familiar to many English readers.

The book presents a sort of historical pageant of the province from the pre-Hellenic period by way of Magna Graecia (ten scenes including several excursions beyond the modern province) and the Roman dominion (when it was the land of the Brutii) to the Byzantine epoch (when heel and toe formed for a time a single province all known as Calabria, from which the heel was subsequently torn off by Lombard conquerors, leaving the name Calabria transferred to the toe) and the subsequent periods of Norman, Angevin, and Spanish domination. Each scene of the pageant takes us to some particular site and generally to some outstanding figures connected with it. Thus in the Greek period we

visit amongst other places Croton to hear of the Pythagoreans, Locri to meet Zaleukos the lawgiver; at Thurii we are told of Alexis and the Middle Comedy, at Tarentum, Heraclea, and Metapontum of Archytas, Archias, and Alexidamos, the athlete celebrated by Bacchylides. In the Roman section we encounter Cicero at Vibo Valentia and Cassiodorus at Squillace. The later periods provide us with pictures of Pope Zacharias, contemporary of Pippin and the English Boniface, the ninth-century Saint Nilus of Rossano, the Norman Robert Guiscard (with quotations from Anna Comnena) and his brother Duke Roger, the Emperor Frederic II, the twelfth-century heretical Abbot Joachim of San Giovanni in Fiore, Barlaam of Seminara, who began teaching Petrarch Greek, Telesio of Cosenza the sixteenth-century philosopher, and the rebel and heretic Campanella of Stilo.

The narrative is freely sprinkled with moral reflections, and the writer shows a serious enthusiasm for all she deals with—the country, the scenery, the people she meets, and those she writes about: some of her best passages are descriptions of scenes at which she was present, e.g. the Good Friday procession at Seminara (p. 250). Dates are seldom given and then not always rightly (1087 for 1187 on p. 217); p. 74 suggests that Pyrrhus came after Hannibal; there are a certain number of misprints (Anaxo-laus p. 82 bis, Hymenoea p. 73, Desponia p. 40, Codex Purpureum Rossanianum p. 183, Giocchino for Gioacchino p. 217; for Thucydides on p. 103 read Herodotus). But the writer does succeed in giving a certain unity to her story of the first Italy by showing that from pre-Hellenic to late Byzantine times and even later its affinities and contacts

were with Sicily and the civilization of Greece.

The book is well illustrated and begins and ends with a pair of full-page maps set side by side: at the beginning Magna

Graecia in buff faces modern Calabria in white; at the end the maps are repeated but with the colours reversed.

P. N. URE.

*University of Reading.*

#### ABBREVIATIONS IN GREEK INSCRIPTIONS OF THE NEAR EAST

M. AVI-YONAH: *Abbreviations in Greek Inscriptions (The Near East, 200 B.C.-A.D. 1100)*. Pp. 125. (The Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine: Supplement to vol. ix.)

London: Milford, 1940. Paper. 8s. net.

MANY epigraphists must often have shared the author's regret that there was no published list of abbreviations in Greek inscriptions at all comparable with that provided for Latin inscriptions by Cagnat in his well-known *Traité*. Some may even have considered the possibility of making such a list, but since nobody has succeeded in doing so Mr. Avi-Yonah's work fills a real and serious gap in Greek epigraphical studies. Actually he has not attempted to cover the whole period or the whole region of Greek inscriptions, but within his self-imposed and logically chosen limits ('The Near East, 200 B.C.-A.D. 1100') he has systematically collected and studied the available material. His bibliography (pp. 5-8) reveals the thoroughness of his search, and his catalogue of abbreviations, which fills seventy-four quarto pages arranged in two columns, gives a total of 4,335 (including 215 from recent publications only, in the Addenda). These are collected from all Greek-speaking lands of the East, the only regions excluded being Greece, Thessaly, Macedonia, Italy, Sicily and the West, and the islands lying off the Greek coast. Inscriptions on movable objects, such as papyri, ostraca, coins, gems, and pottery-stamps are excluded, with a few important exceptions, but certain characteristic Byzantine documents later than 1100 have been added.

Such a list by itself would prove of great service to epigraphists either when confronted by an unrecognizable abbreviation, or in search of parallels. We may note, for instance, that M may represent twenty different words, that

there are twelve different abbreviations for ἐπίσκοπος and for Σεβαστός, and no less than thirty-two for Ἰνδικτίων (in the nominative alone). But the author has added enormously to the value of his work by giving us what we lack in Cagnat's list, the date, as exact as possible, for each example; and in his careful discussion (pp. 9-44) he includes a series of comparative tables summarizing various conclusions drawn from his material, such as the relative frequency in different centuries of the rival methods of suspension and contraction, or the relative prevalence of abbreviations in different types of inscription, Christian, pagan, &c. Minute attention is also paid to other refinements, such as superposed letters or lines, ligatures, punctuation-marks, and the incredible variety of *sigla* which run riot in Byzantine texts.

It must suffice to draw very brief attention to the author's more general conclusions as to the circumstances which favoured the spread of the practice, such as the influence of the abbreviations adopted of necessity in Ptolemaic papyri, or of Latin epigraphy (e.g. by the spread of Roman citizenship with its inevitable shortening of *praenomina* and *nomina*, of the names of military formations and other familiar formulae), or again in Byzantine epigraphy of the fact that the clergy were the literate class. Of particular interest are the remarks on the bearing of this material on the *Nomina sacra* first elucidated by Traube (pp. 26-7), for his views must now be modified in certain important respects, notably by the author's conclusion that Syria and not Egypt was the country where *Nomina sacra* were first adopted for use in inscriptions.

The publication is well arranged and a pleasure to handle. The Oxford University Press has responded nobly to

the call on its typographical resources resulting from the innumerable ligatures and odd symbols which must have been specially cast. The few misprints observed (pp. 8, E. T. for T. E. Lawrence, 9, 13, 16) are of no moment. It remains to express the gratitude of epigraphists to Mr. Avi-Yonah on the completion of his laborious task, and to

assure him that his work not only will serve as a model for a companion volume to cover the regions which he has not been able to include in it, but will very greatly facilitate that work when he, or some other scholar of equal enterprise, decides to undertake it.

A. M. WOODWARD.

*University of Sheffield.*

#### CHRISTIANITY AND CLASSICAL CULTURE

Charles Norris COCHRANE: *Christianity and Classical Culture. A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine.* Pp. vii + 523. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Cloth, 30s. net.

PROFESSOR COCHRANE has undertaken in this book to deal with a subject of fundamental importance, namely 'the revolution in thought and action which came about through the impact of Christianity upon the Graeco-Roman world'. As he very properly says, it has not received, 'especially perhaps from English-speaking scholars', all the attention which it deserves, and he may be congratulated upon his attempt to supply the want. The treatment of the subject falls into three parts, Reconstruction, Renovation, and Regeneration. The first part is an exposition of the ideals, ethical, social, and political, which underlay the *pax Augusta*, that great and imposing attempt at the establishment of an ordered society in which the Graeco-Roman conception of a civilized human life might be realized. The contributions to the expression of this ideal made from the side of Roman patriotism by Virgil and Livy and from the side of philosophy by Cicero are ably described, though by a strange oversight the discussion of the *De Officiis* does not once mention Panaetius. The second part, Renovation, discusses the period between Constantine and Theodosius and the attempt of the Christian Emperors to find in the alliance with Christianity a new 'principle of political cohesion'. The final section, Regeneration, discusses the intellectual alternative which Christianity had to offer the Graeco-Roman world in place of its inherited religion and its traditional philosophy. The theological discussions about the

nature of the Godhead culminated in Athanasius and Augustine in the attempt to substitute for the rationalism of Greek philosophy a new explanation of the universe based upon the acceptance of the doctrine of the Trinity and a new method of approach to all the questions which Graeco-Roman philosophy had had to leave unsolved.

Within the limits of each of these three sections Professor Cochrane's treatment of the facts is comprehensive and able. He is right in treating the *pax Augusta* as, in effect, the establishment not merely of a new constitution for the Empire but of a new and, it seemed, permanent framework for the development and expansion of the best life for mankind as it was conceived in the Graeco-Roman world. His description of the inadequacy of this conception and of its gradual breakdown, of the futile attempts of the 'Christian' emperors to patch it up by an alliance with the Church, and of the meagre results of that alliance, is very well done. And the concluding section, especially the exposition of the new Christian philosophy represented by Augustine, is a very fine piece of work.

But while this book gives the reader a more impressive and at times a more brilliant presentation of its subject than most of its predecessors upon the same period, one is aware of a certain lacuna. The Graeco-Roman civilization of the Empire had broken down: the Church after long persecution had at last ousted paganism as the recognized religion of the Empire: its most eminent doctors claimed to have provided a philosophy based upon a theology which furnished a key to the solution of all the problems which had baffled the philosophers of

heathenism. Is it really the case that Constantine and his Christian successors looked to Christianity to provide a new 'principle of political cohesion', and, if they did, why were they so signally disappointed? Why, in view of the immense influence exercised by (e.g.) Ambrose, was the total result of the new alliance only the proscription of heathen rites, the securing to the Catholic clergy of a position among the privileged classes, and a few niggling changes in the Code? Professor Cochrane is well aware of the meagre nature of the result, but he does not furnish any adequate scrutiny of the reasons for it. No treatment of this problem can be completely satisfactory without a careful study of the somewhat complicated attitude of the Christian community as a whole to the secular order in which it found itself. 'My kingdom is not of this world' was a saying which lent itself to more than one interpretation. Under the stress of persecution the antagonism between Christianity and *hoc saeculum* became sharpened till Tertullian, in spite of all his appreciation of the benefits which Roman rule had conferred on the world, could say *nec ulla magis res aliena quam publica*. This attitude, shaped (no doubt) by the millennial expectations of an earlier Christian generation, persisted even when the hope of a speedy end of the world had faded: the 'true Christian' must remove himself as far as possible from 'this world', and from its interests. But the wider the spread of Christianity the less was it possible to maintain this attitude. The 'true Christian' had in time not only to withdraw from 'the world' but to dissociate himself from the majority

of his fellow Christians. By the fourth century this inner cleavage in Christianity is complete: we have on the one side the monastic movement, including those pious communities of which Augustine in the *De moribus ecclesiae Catholicae* speaks, for example, at Milan, and the vast majority of Christians who, educated in the same schools as their heathen fellow-citizens, had 'conformed to this world' and were soldiers, lawyers, rhetoricians, and administrators, like anybody else. It was impossible to expect that a man like Ambrose on becoming a bishop, even if he had an emperor under his influence, would make any serious attempt to remedy, on Christian principles, an order of society and a political structure which he had accepted as normal all his life. He can tell Vigilius in a famous letter that there is to be no *commune corpus* between Christians and the heathen world by the bond of marriage; but this is an ecclesiastical safeguard to ensure *fidei concordia* in the home, not the instinctive feeling of Tertullian that there is an irreconcilable conflict between Christianity and the secular order of the Graeco-Roman world. It was no doubt too late in the fourth century to make any radical reform in the social and political structure, but the real point is that the Christians as a whole did not see that any radical reform was necessary.

But with this reservation Professor Cochrane's book can be warmly commended as a serious and important contribution to the historical literature of the period.

R. M. HENRY.

*University of St. Andrews.*

#### THE RELIGIOUS POLICY OF ANASTASIUS I

Peter CHARANIS: *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: the Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491-518*. (University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History, No. 26.) Pp. 102. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1939. Cloth, \$1.50.

THIS is a careful and straightforward account of the religious history of the

reign of Anastasius, and the sub-title accurately describes its subject-matter: it is a pity that the more ambitious title should have been prefixed to it. Mr. Charanis gives a clear and well-documented narrative of the development of the emperor's policy, followed by a useful discussion of the sources and a bibliography. But while he shows a good grasp of his material, it is difficult to accept

the central thesis of the book. He believes that Anastasius was 'a pragmatist whose eyes were fixed upon the actual conditions of the Empire' (p. 19), that 'the underlying purpose of the emperor's religious policy was the establishment of ecclesiastical peace' (p. 25), and that in the pursuit of this aim there is 'little evidence that his religious policy was shaped by his own religious convictions' (p. 13). No one would deny that Anastasius, like every other emperor, aimed at the establishment of ecclesiastical peace: but that he was a pragmatist who shaped his policy uninfluenced by his own religious convictions is a highly questionable opinion which seems to be belied by the known facts of his reign. It is clear, for instance, that Anastasius' chief recommendation as successor to Zeno was his outstanding piety and uprightness of character; but it is equally clear that the chief objection to him came, and with good reason, from the Chalcedonian party in Constantinople, whose leader, the patriarch Euphemius, had already forbidden his preaching in the Great Church and would only agree to his coronation after receiving a solemnly attested profession of Chalcedonian orthodoxy. Subsequent events showed that these suspicions were more than justified. As the emperor's position became more secure, so did his policy become more openly Monophysite, and, while it can be argued that this was perhaps the best road to the establishment of peace in some parts of the east, Mr. Charanis' statement that 'in localities where one or other party predominated he intervened as little as possible' (p. 25) is surely contradicted

by the whole history of his dealings with the patriarchate of Constantinople, from which Euphemius and Macedonius, both moderate and highly popular Chalcedonians, were successively ejected for resisting the emperor's Monophysism. Indeed one can only accept Mr. Charanis' view of the emperor's motives if one is prepared to reject the contemporary evidence not only for his religious convictions but also for his prudence and statesmanship, for, if his attempt to force Monophysism on the European provinces was really undertaken for purely secular reasons, it was a singularly inept and short-sighted policy which produced in the revolt of Vitalian a very serious threat to the stability of his throne. In fact, in spite of Mr. Charanis' disparaging reference to Duchesne's view of Anastasius (p. 89), it was surely not just 'a certain measure of prejudice' but a sound reading of the evidence which led that great scholar to regard the emperor's religious convictions as the direct cause of the main weakness in an otherwise very able reign: 'il ne fit guère de sottises, si ce n'est dans le domaine religieux.'<sup>1</sup> *Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum.* It is a tribute to Mr. Charanis' objectivity of treatment that this conclusion should appear so clear from his own narrative: it is only odd that he does not reach it himself.

J. N. L. MYRES.

Christ Church, Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> L. Duchesne, *L'Église au sixième siècle* (1925), 8.

#### THE CONCLUSION OF ZEUS

A. B. COOK: *Zeus, a Study in Ancient Religion*. Volume III, *Zeus, God of the Dark Sky*. Two vols. (Part I, Text and Notes: Part II, Appendixes and Index). Pp. xxx+1299; 83 plates; 932 figures. Cambridge: University Press, 1940. Cloth, £8. 8s. net.

My first words must be those of warm congratulation to Dr. Cook on the completion of the immense task which he

set himself a generation ago. Whatever differences of opinion there may be as to the methods followed and the conclusions reached, Dr. Cook has performed a very great service to scholarship by amassing this vast collection of material and by presenting it in a way which both delights the reader by the learning and ingenuity which it displays, and keeps him thinking all the time.

All the characteristics of Dr. Cook's method which were enumerated in my review of vol. i in 1915 could be illustrated from the present volume, but need not be described again. It is often difficult to accept conclusions based on conjectures (however ingenious) supported by other conjectures or by evidence from sources very remote either in time or in distance from the subject immediately under discussion, but at least the materials for other conclusions are all there, and probably no one else could have brought them together so completely. Vol. iii is, in parts at least, as difficult to follow as its predecessors; digressions within digressions, and yet others within these, take the reader far away from the ostensible subject; and the method of printing is equally maddening. A sentence begun on p. 80 is not continued till p. 89 (the intervening pages being occupied with notes); there are similar gaps after pp. 190 (10 pages), 403 (13 pages); and on p. 642 (after 7 pages of notes without text) there are two lines of text ending with 'on the', and the next word 'Hypanis' is not discovered until p. 653, where we are given just over one line of text. The notes themselves, owing to inadequate paragraphing and spacing, are often almost unreadable. It is very unfortunate that it should be necessary to search with so much difficulty and distraction for the valuable matter concealed in the amorphous mass of which this volume is composed. The indexes are a great accomplishment, but there is no index to the whole work. The only *erratum* which I have noticed, not included in the table given, is the printing of 'Hercules' for 'Amphitryon' on p. 517, l. 5. It is a pity that the frequent references to Sir D'Arcy Thompson's *Glossary of Greek Birds* are all to the old edition, and not to the greatly improved and enlarged edition of 1936, and this sometimes leads to undeserved criticisms. Comic fragments are quoted from Meineke, not from Kock, whose edition has long been the standard. The illustrations are, as before, in every way admirable, and many are new; numismatists in particular will find much to

interest them in these. The etymological discussions are many and interesting, though often inevitably inconclusive; I may refer especially to those on ἐνοσίχθων and kindred words (pp. 7-9); αἴολος (p. 109, where the connexion of the word with *soul*, and the identification of winds and souls, and its consequences, seem to me to be very speculative); Ἀθηνᾶ (pp. 191-200); *Danae*, *Danaoi*, *Daunioi* (pp. 364 ff.); and νέκταρ (p. 497).

The first section of the volume is devoted to earthquakes, attributed rarely in the Classical period, but oftener afterwards, to Zeus. The usual attribution to Poseidon is explained by the fact that most of the 'seismic lines traceable in Greece are definitely maritime and the rest within easy reach of the sea'. (I have not seen this suggestion before.) The appellation *γαυηόχος*, however, is explained not only by the common idea of the sea supporting or holding the earth, but also (very improbably, as it seems to me) by vases depicting gigantomachies, in which Poseidon is poised a great mass of rock which he is about to hurl on his enemy. It is hardly possible to maintain *both* explanations.

The section which follows, on 'Zeus and the Clouds', is largely about Aristophanes' *Birds* and *Nephelokokkygia*, with long notes on oaths of the *νῆ τὸν χῆνα* type, on the notion of a cosmic wall (which probably never occurred to Aristophanes), on various birds, on gigantomachies (richly illustrated) with a very speculative conjecture that Porphyron was a prehistoric king who claimed to be Zeus incarnate, and another connecting the Cloud-Cuckoo-City with an Argive cult. There is much that is of interest for readers of the *Birds*, but they will do well to be cautious. Thirty-five pages deal nominally with Clouds as personified in ritual and myth, but in fact, more with the birth of Dionysus from the thigh of Zeus than with any other subjects. The interpretation on p. 33 of *κεφαληρέταν* (applied to Pericles in a fragment of Cratinus) as meaning 'collector of heads, crowd-collector', does not convince me; I doubt if Aristophanes meant anything more than a suggestion of 'Zeus with

the big head'. On p. 70 the worship of the Clouds is ascribed to the Orphics on the strength of a late Orphic hymn; but the hymn does not seem to justify this; it is just a poetical appeal to the Clouds for rain, such as might equally well have been made by Wordsworth. (The connexion with the Classical period of many passages of Christian and other literature quoted about this point is very fanciful.) The assumption of pp. 76 ff. seems to be that any phasma substituted for a real person must have been a cloud. The texts quoted (e.g. Eur. *Bacch.* 286 ff.) do not justify this.

The next section, on 'Zeus and the Winds', contains much about the Control of the Winds; about Aeolus, whose island is regarded as an other-world 'island of souls' and whose legend is made to explain why the Ptolemies married their sisters; then a full and interesting discussion of the Tritopatores, Tritogeneia, and Triton. (The evidence for treating Triton as a wind-god, a lord of souls and protector of the dead, and therefore figured on sarcophagi, is mostly late and post-classical; I am not sure that the Tritons on most of the late monuments are not there just as the natural attendants on any voyage.) On p. 140 we are suddenly brought back to Zeus. I doubt if Dr. Cook is right in interpreting Aesch. *Suppl.* 593, *τὸ πᾶν μῆχαρ οὐρανὸς Ζεύς*, as if *οὐρανός* were *Οὐρανός*. (I have the same doubt about *ὅλβιε Ζεῦ*, ibid. 525, treated on p. 631 as an appeal to *Ζεὺς Όλβιος* as worshipped in a special cult.) On p. 152 there is the conjecture that the statue of the 'praying boy' on the Asiatic shore prompted Virgil's *stabant orantes . . . tendebantque manus ripae ulterioris amore*. Surely Virgil did not need such prompting? The conjecture seems very far-fetched.

The section on 'Zeus and the Dew' begins with the Arrhephoria and suggests that the *ἀρρηφόροι* carried dew (the seed of Zeus or the Sky-god) to the womb of Ge, and brought back the resultant infant, the babe Erichthonius. But the identification of *ἀρρηφόροι* with *ἐρσηφόροι* seems to be disproved by Deubner (*Attische Feste*, pp. 13 ff.), and the carrying of dew 'on their heads' (as

Pausanias says) would be odd: the *ἀρρηφά* were probably of another kind, and I cannot accept (though I have not space to argue the point) Dr. Cook's linguistic arguments. When, a little later, he suggests that Hephaestus (who is said to have gradually ousted Zeus as a spectator of the presentation of the infant Erichthonius to Athena in the monuments) was 'in the remote historic past' the husband of Athena, and the pair identical with Cronos and Rhea, I cannot but feel that the vases and most of the evidence quoted show only that the two were often associated, and that it is quite unjustifiable to twist the myths which definitely assert the unimpaired virginity of Athena in spite of assaults by Hephaestus into evidence for the opposite (pp. 221-2); to say that Erichthonius was child of Hephaestus by Athena is to assert exactly what the myths do *not* represent. The rest of the section contains much improbable reasoning, especially about Tithonus and his supposed connexion with dew. As cicadas were believed to feed on dew, we are given ten pages of notes on tettix-ornaments (interesting enough in themselves), and a conjecture that Tithonus, who fed on ambrosia (which = honey = dew—an equation at least as often false as true) was originally the cicada and the name onomatopoeic. (What sound did it represent? The actual sound made by the cicada seems very remote.)

The longest section in the book follows—about 600 pages on 'Zeus and Rain'. It begins with full accounts of rain-making magic in modern and ancient Greece. (I cannot believe that *ἄλαδε μύσται* was a rain-charm, nor that the 'ear of corn reaped in silence' at Eleusis is needed to explain St. John xii. 20.) After a brief account of rain-making ceremonies in the cults of Zeus and of various expressions (some obviously metaphorical) connecting him with rain, we have a digression of many pages on the Thundering Legion, and a treatment (over 100 pages long) of the conception of rain as water poured through a sieve or a holed vessel, including discussions of the Danaid myths, the *Λουτροφόρος* customs, Cerberus,

Tantalus, the subterranean topography of the Orphic tablets, the *mundus* and *lapis manalis*. Later come accounts of the story of Danae, rains of blood, food, or stones, fire-extinguishing rains, human sacrifices to obtain rain, and then (as suggested by an account of the cult of Zeus 'Yérrios') a very long discussion of the Dipolieia and the *Bouphónia* which formed part of the ceremony. Very briefly, Dr. Cook's view is (1) that Zeus Polieus, in whose honour the rites were celebrated, was a Storm-God. (This is a conjecture based on the identification, very inadequately proved, of a storm-god who appears on certain Hellenistic Athenian coins, with Zeus Polieus.) (2) That the connexion of the Dipolieia in legend with a certain Thaulon of Eleusis, who first sacrificed an ox, identifies the Thaulonidai of Athens with the *Boutrípōi* (a notice of Hesychius giving some slight confirmation), and, the *Boutrípōi* being a family of the Kerykes, the cult was brought by the Eleusinian Kerykes to Athens. (3) That Thaulon's name 'stands in obvious relation to that of Zeus Thaulios', whose cult has been detected in Thessaly, and whose name Dr. Cook connects with *tau*, 'dew'. (Other scholars give quite different interpretations.) (4) That Zeus Polieus, the (conjectural) Storm-God, and Zeus Thaulios (never connected in any evidence with Thaulon or with any Athenian ceremony or clan) imply that the Dipolieia was a moisture-charm. The hazardousness of all this, even with such other mythological connexions of persons as are reported or conjectured on p. 603, needs no proof. Readers can scarcely fail to feel, with even better justification than the companions of Socrates did, that they are *παρ' ἔκαστον τὸ ἔρωτημα σμικρὸν παραγόμενοι*. This will be even more so when they reach the point (pp. 656 ff.) where Dr. Cook connects the striking of the ox at the Dipolieia (for he identifies the beast with Zeus Polieus himself and the ceremony with the ritual slaying of the God) with the striking of Zeus on the head with the double axe by Hephaestus to bring about the birth of Athena. (That a double axe was used at the Dipolieia

rests on the conjectural interpretation of a frieze in the church of Panagia Gorgo-Epekoos.) The argument (pp. 661-2) that the Athenians would never have tolerated the presentation in art of Zeus as struck on the head with an axe 'unless behind the myth there had been some ritual practice of immemorial sanction', such as that of the Dipolieia, seems to be sheer assumption; they certainly tolerated much less creditable tales about Zeus in poetry, and the demand for ritual explanations everywhere is a good deal overdone. There is no evidence at all that the Athenians of the fifth century A.D. (or indeed of any other period) were conscious that the ox at the Dipolieia *was* Zeus; the identification is Dr. Cook's conjecture (p. 606). As a matter of fact, the illustrations of the birth of Athena in art, which Dr. Cook gives very fully, seem to show that the part played in the birth by the God with an axe was *not* originally part of the myth, and that the Eileithyiai managed the affair quite well without him; he is absent from many of the representations, late as well as early. There are at least equal difficulties in the further statement (p. 737) that 'the divine ox was struck with the double axe in order that he might come to life again with vigour unimpaired and work for his people as of old. Zeus is hit over the head for much the same purpose. The blow releases Athena, a further manifestation of his might . . . Zeus himself lives on in her younger, fresher life.' The subsection on 'the superannuation of Zeus' entirely fails to show that Zeus was ever regarded as dying at the birth of Athena, or as ceasing to reign.

Space does not allow me to discuss the long, and in many ways illuminating, treatment of Athena which follows. There is some very hazardous argument (pp. 791-4) about Athena and the Owl, and it is rather startling to find the goddess traced back to a type presented on a Sumerian clay-tablet of about 2000 B.C. (pp. 832 ff.), and the *aegis* explained as the *exuviae* of the snake and the owl, which Athena once was.

After a section entitled 'Zeus and the

'Meteorites' (in which Zeus only appears towards the end, though much very interesting matter precedes), the work ends with 'General Conclusions with regard to Zeus as God of the Dark Sky', and some profound reflections on the religion of Zeus as a stage in the progressive revelation of the Divine—a worthy conclusion of a most remarkable work.

## STUDIES IN HONOUR OF NILSSON

*ΔΡΑΓΜΑ* Martino P. Nilsson a. d. IV id. Iul. MCMXXXIX dedicatum. Pp. xv+656; 95 illustrations. Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae, Series Altera, I. Lund: Gleerup (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1939. Paper.

THESE studies in celebration of Nilsson's sixty-fifth birthday are distributed over a wide variety of subjects. The title of the volume invites one to seek for a common characteristic, but it is scarcely possible to find any, save perhaps in the general effect of a technical competence which abjures the humarer interests, and stands out the more starkly because of the difficulty too obviously experienced by many of the contributors in expressing themselves in languages other than their own.

Among the articles dealing with literary subjects one may note a sober examination by B. Axelson of the thirty-four lines which appear after Juvenal vi. 365 in the Bodleian MS. Dissenting from Leo, Housman, and the rest, Axelson decides that these lines are spurious. His reasons are cogent, and he is at pains to dissociate himself from the type of argument favoured by U. Knoche, who, in *Philologus* 1938, p. 196, also condemned this passage. In another useful article E. Löfstedt discusses the difficult use of the genitive of the gerund in Tacitus, *Annals*, xiii. 26, xv. 5, 21; he produces many passages from other, chiefly later, sources to show that this use of gerund for infinitive is not so unparalleled as used to be supposed. E. Nachmanson studies the 'adverbial partitive genitive' in Greek. It is common enough, as, for example, with verbs of eating and drinking, but a very thorough consideration of the

The Appendixes are about Floating Islands, the Prompting Eros, and the Hieros Gamos. The Addenda consist mainly of additional references and illustrations to the earlier volumes, and a very few corrections or answers to objections.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

usage sheds unexpected light on some hard passages in the Hippocratic writings. A. Svensson produces well thought-out statistics to show that as a rule the article is much less frequent in the messengers' speeches than elsewhere in Euripides; here is further evidence of Euripidean 'archaism', or at least of a tendency to imitate the epic style. The articles of C. Höeg, who argues against the current view that the second pleading of the Verres trial is fictitious, and of A. Nygren on St. Augustine's rehabilitation (under Neoplatonic influence) of the word 'amor', ought not to be overlooked.

Many articles are concerned in the main with matters of mythology and of religion. These include F. Blatt's publication of a new text of Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, x. 733-50, an apologetic work whose author (he holds) cannot now be identified; B. Olsson on threatening and abusive language towards the gods; S. Eitrem on an 'areatalogy' of Apollo, first published in *Hermes*, 1920, p. 188; A. W. Persson on the prehistoric origins of Hellenic mythology; and a few articles on Scandinavian folk-lore. There is a noteworthy effort by E. Arbman to draw a distinction between 'mythic and religious thought'. Religious thought asserts a supernatural power acting directly upon nature, mythic thought describes this supernatural action as indirect, attributing to it in graphic and anthropomorphic manner the use of external machinery such as mortals use. Arbman applies his distinction to Homer; anthropomorphic descriptions belong to the poet speaking in his own person, while his characters are as a rule content with the bare statement of the

gods' intervention. That many myths, though by no means religious, imply a background of religious belief is a sound thesis; but one does not see why Arbman wishes to reserve the epithet 'religious' for the purely colourless and abstract. There is no discussion of the comparative validity to be assigned to these varieties of 'thought'. Rather Arbman appears to assume that each is uniformly invalid—that is, if one is to take seriously his incidental assertion of belief in an empty and mythical philosophy of 'nature' as an 'all-embracing' system. On this article one would like to have had the opinion of J. Lindblom, who makes a similar distinction in an essay contrasting Job and Prometheus: the O.T. idea of God (as, e.g., unchangeable) is 'a deeply religious one', whereas the Aeschylean idea is 'typically mythological'. Another article which makes for some clarification

of principles in this sphere is E. Briem's 'Totemism and Animal Worship'. He has little difficulty in showing with the help of Frazer that animal worship is not derived from totemism (which is not a religion), and takes occasion to correct a statement of Nilsson's that totemism was 'certainly the basis of the Egyptian religion'.

Most of the contributions which are concerned with history and archaeology—the largest class—aim at the description or classification of finds. Some, however, are of more general interest, e.g., A. Boëthius on Vitruvius as a critic of Augustan architecture, and A. Wifstrand on the Greek titles of Roman emperors. The thirty-seven articles are followed by a minutely detailed bibliography of Nilsson's publications.

J. TATE.

*University of St. Andrews.*

#### THE HUMANIST TRADITION

Gilbert MURRAY: *Stoic, Christian and Humanist*. Pp. 189. London: C. A. Watts & Co., 1940. Cloth, 5s. net.

DR. MURRAY has collected in this small volume four essays, three of which have been already published. 'Pagan Religion and Philosophy at the Time of Christ' appeared in *The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge*; 'The Stoic Philosophy' in the author's *Essays and Addresses*; 'The Conception of Another Life' in the *Edinburgh Review*. The new chapter is last year's Comte Lecture, entitled 'What is Permanent in Positivism'.

In a short preface Dr. Murray explains his position—'a profound belief in ethics and disbelief in all revelational religions'. Rejecting, on humanitarian and on intellectual grounds, the dogmas and the mythology of orthodox Christianity, he reaffirms a humanism whose 'real basis is the rock of human experience'. All four essays have something to contribute to his argument. In the first, a masterly if brief restatement of earlier Greek ethical systems leads to an account of the 'failure of nerve' which made possible the 'Saviour Re-

ligions' of the Hellenistic period. Christianity is shown to have affinities with the rest of these, and with earlier thought; it is admitted to be less superstitious than its fellow creeds. The article on Stoicism will be already well known to many readers; it stands as a fine exposition of the psychological and spiritual bases of the system, and ends with an appraisal of the 'unproven belief in the Friend behind phenomena'—here attributed to ancient and ineradicable experiences in the life of the gregarious animal who dare not be alone. A sensitive recognition of the fine inconsistencies of Stoicism is the chief mark of this essay. The article on the conception of Another Life adopts the view that the Mysteries were based on initiation-ceremonies; it is full of detail of Greek and other rites and apocalypses, set forth with an often satirical ruthlessness of touch. The belief in a life of compensation hereafter is rejected in favour of the Stoic conception—the true tribunal, and the true refuge, are to be found in a man's own soul. But the refuge is only temporary, and human happiness is ultimately

found in human fellowship. The essay on Positivism has less immediate affinity with Classical thought; it completes the author's argument with a relentless exposure of the fallacies and inconsistencies inherent in many forms of the belief in a personal God. Positivism is held to be the nobler creed because it 'takes the risk', without the surety of reward for the good life.

This is not the place to challenge Dr. Murray's main thesis, or rather his main denial. In its bearing on Classical studies this latest volume contains, it need not be said, much to inform and more to stimulate. It will be welcomed by all his readers.

D. TARRANT.

*Bedford College, London.*

## SHORT REVIEWS

F. M. COMBELLACK: *Omitted Speech Formulas in Homer*. University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Volume 12, No. 4, pp. 43-56. Berkeley: University of California Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1939. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.

THE ways in which Homer passes from a speech to the next, or to something else, are familiar: *ως φάτο—ως εἰπὼν—ἡ ῥα, καὶ τὴν δ' ἡμεῖσθετε ἐπειτα—ως ἐφάμυν, η δ' αὐτίκ' ἀμειβετο—ητοι δ' γ' ως εἰπὼν—ως ἔφατ', 'Αργείος δὲ*—and the like; and he uses such phrases so often that wherever he dispenses with them we have to ask why. Mr. Combellack 'comble une lacune': he has studied all the speeches after which no such formula occurs. One of the places is *X* 498, where he suspects that the formula of transition 'is omitted because it would be too clumsy'. That suspicion may be thought applicable to other passages of which he gives a different account. But, having examined the ways in which Thucydides passes from narrative to speech, from speech to speech, and from speech to narrative, and seeming to myself to discern why here and there he does without any formula, I dare say in Homer also a reason for every exception may be divined. Not all the reasons here advanced will commend themselves; but Mr. Combellack writes modestly and readably, and on some passages, such as that to which he gives most space, 'the much disputed Helios episode in *μ* 374-390', he throws welcome light.

E. HARRISON.

*Trinity College, Cambridge.*

Roy E. WATKINS: *A History of Paragraph Divisions in Horace's Epistles*. (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, X.) Pp. 134. University of Iowa, 1940. Paper, \$2.75.

THIS work consists of 3 pages of introduction, 109 of figures, and 3 of conclusion, and is presumably designed *editorum in usum*. Division of classical texts into paragraphs corresponding to changes in the thought is a matter of fashion; it appears that Horace's sixteenth-century editors used it freely, but afterwards there was a reaction which lasted until the middle of the nineteenth century. The analysis shows where every edition consulted begins a new paragraph, what editor is originally

responsible for each, and how many followed him in each successive era. The compiler notes (p. 124) that by no means all editors favoured any division at *Ars Poetica* 295, where Norden held that the second part of the poem (*De Poeta*) began. On p. 123 he gives a scheme indicating his own preferences in the matter. In an appended chronological list of over 300 editions of Horace I cannot find the name of Bentley.

Except in the making of the scheme mentioned above this work gave no scope for the display of any quality save industry, and it may well be doubted whether anyone will be benefited by it sufficiently to justify the head of the Department of Classical Languages at the University of Iowa in advising any of his students to undertake it.

L. P. WILKINSON.

*King's College, Cambridge.*

Sir Aurel STEIN, K.C.I.E.: *Old Routes of Western Iran*. Pp. xxvi+432; 112 illustrations, 31 plates, 25 plans, 7 sketch maps, and map of route. London: Macmillan, 1940. Cloth, 42s. net.

THIS book is the record of the author's fourth journey in Iran, in 1935-6, from Shiraz through Khuzistan and Luristan to Lake Urumiyeh. It contains much of interest besides the journey. Many trial excavations illustrated the extension northwards of the chalcolithic culture of Gedrosia; the Kassite origin of the Luristan bronzes was confirmed; there is a detailed localization of Alexander's operations at the Persian Gates and against the Uxians. There is the first accurate description of the sculptures at Tang-i-Sarwak; it is suggested that the colossal relief of a priest with frizzed hair pointing to a baetyl on an altar may be a Magus; the inscription on the altar is pronounced by Dr. W. B. Henning to be an unknown development of Parthian Pahlavi. The author visited the much-plundered shrine at Shami, whence came among other things the now famous life-size bronze statue of an Iranian and two marble Hellenistic heads, one perhaps an Aphrodite, all now at Teheran. He thinks the shrine housed a local syncretized cult of Greek deities and royal personages; among the debris was found a bronze face-mask, which from the treatment of the hair might well be Alexander. The Karakto caves were explored, and revealed a

complex of rock-cut chambers; a squeeze of the Greek inscription over the doorway, which Dr. M. N. Tod thinks is probably late fourth or early third century B.C., confirms Professor Wilhelm's restoration; the graffito of horseman added to the inscription, and similar graffiti inside the cave, prove conclusively that this cave-shrine is the *templum* of Heracles on Mt. Sanbulos, mentioned by Tacitus. Heracles commonly represents Verethraghna; but Verethraghna was not a horseman, and M. Cumont suggests that Mithra, now known as a horseman, had here superseded him. But why did Greeks represent a rider-god by Heracles?—On p. 307 Antiochus II should be Demetrius II.

W. W. TARN.

Muirtown, Inverness.

A. H. McDONALD: *The Rise of Roman Imperialism*. Pp. 18. Sydney: Australasian Medical Publishing Co., 1940. Paper.

This inaugural address by the Reader in Ancient World History in the University of Sydney is mainly concerned with the second century B.C., when the Republic, having overcome Carthage, was for a time diverted from her real task of organizing the western Mediterranean to interfere in the Hellenistic East and thus involved in problems which her rulers failed to understand and which they tackled by such methods as dissipated their own resources and led to the breakdown of their system in the Civil Wars; so that it was not until revolution had produced the Caesars that Rome was able to enter upon her true constructive work. The records, as Dr. McDonald argues, are for us confused and obscured by later tendentious interpretation: Polybius' attempt to apply Greek orthodox political theory—the 'balance of elements'—senatorial tradition, and Augustan idealization. The general result of his criticism might be stated thus: the Senate's policy was throughout dominated by strategic notions, especially of security, and failed to understand the economic and political consequences, both at home and in the East. The false estimate of the danger to Rome from Macedonia and Syria on the one hand, and on the other the lure of booty and martial fame in the eastern wars, produced Polybius' 'miracle of our own time', the Roman domination of the East; yet the Senate which had achieved this tried to evade its consequences and to 'return to normal'. Even then, Dr. McDonald suggests, there was a chance of a true reconstruction in the ideas of Scipio the Younger, for the strained economy and political structure of Italy; but this was frustrated by the too sudden and violent methods of the Gracchi—though their aims, both in agrarian reform and in enlisting the services of the new equestrian order, were sound enough. The too delicate balance and too narrow basis of senatorial rule were irretrievably destroyed, and with the loss of stability the imperial problem could not be handled.

'Rome would have gained ultimately if her conquest of the East had followed only after stimulating achievement in western imperialism'—that is the writer's case, a forcibly argued and fully illustrated one, which, whether one accepts it or not, is a really valuable and indeed painfully topical contribution.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

Patricia BEESLEY: *The Revival of the Humanities in American Education*. Pp. xv+201. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1940. Cloth, 13s. 6d. net.

THIS is an account of the 'general' courses in 'the Humanities', i.e. in literature, language, history, philosophy, art, which in recent years have been called into existence to balance similar courses in the Social and Natural Sciences. Their creation is due to 'the current youth problem in society', to discontent 'with higher education as now organised' and with 'extreme specialisation'; and they have appeared in many American universities and colleges. More has been heard of Humanism in the U.S.A. than here, and it has many sects in education—Scholastic, Scientific, Catholic, American Religious, New, Classical, and others. Miss Beesley summarizes their tenets, explains the growth of the movement, and lists forty-seven curricula in the 'Humanities'. Her work is largely scissors and paste: but it is thoroughly, competently, and clearly done, and is a valuable account of a movement important socially and educationally; the bibliography and references are particularly useful. Though some tincture of the classics appears in most of the courses, their aim is 'a review of human culture and values in the light of modern, and particularly American, conditions', and the book is only incidentally concerned with classical humanism, and treats its fortunes in this country very superficially. (The names of Gilbert Murray, Burnet, and Lowes Dickinson do not appear.) Miss Beesley chronicles rather than criticizes, and we are left without an account of the effects and success of these experiments. The problem is real and important; the attempt to solve it is characteristic of the vitality and spirit of enterprise in American education. But one wonders whether the criticism, quoted here, on 'survey' courses does not apply to others: 'A generation eager for short cuts, interested in product but not in process, will find its idea of education realised in the orientation course.' The English in which the book is written is not its best feature, and the author and many of the authorities whom she quotes have something to learn from classical ideas of style, if not from the classical humanities.

R. W. LIVINGSTONE.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

## CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XXXV. 3: JULY 1940

M. L. W. Laistner, *Some Reflections on Latin Historical Writing in the Fifth Century*. R. J. Getty, *The Introduction to the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus*: (1) v. 1, retains *nautis*, taking *deum freta* together and explaining *prima magnis freta pervia nautis* as hypallage for *primis magna f.p.n.*, and adds speculations about the opening of Varro's *Argonautica*; (2) v. 10, reads *alenti* (Campbell and Bonner); (3) vv. 11-21, reads *13 namque potes*, transposing this and *sancite pater* (11), 11 *venerande*, 13 *nigrantem et pulvere*, 17 *erit Tyriae ... carinae* (Heins.), 19 *sub te duce*, and stops after *instiutet* (16) and *magistris* (18). P. W. Townsend, *The Oil Tribute of Africa at the Time of Julius Caesar*: the levy recorded in *B. Afr.* 97. 3 must have been exacted not from Leptis but from the Emporia region, of which it was the centre. J. A. Notopoulos, *Porphyry's Life of Plato*: the fragments of P.'s Life and the Syriac version of Bar-Hebraeus agree with Apuleius, *De Platone*, which must be used as the basis for reconstruction; the probable source of P.'s Life is Arianus Didymus. M. E. Keenan, *The Terminology of Witchcraft in the Works of St. Augustine*: a catalogue supplementing Burriss in *C.P.* xxxi. 2. A. K. Lake on Prop. i. 22 reads *sit* in v. 6 and takes 3-5 as protasis, 6 as apodosis, of a condition, *dolor* as complement to both *sunt* and *sit*, and *tu* as addressed to *pulvis*. I. M. Linforth, *Greek and Egyptian Gods*: against Lattimore (*C.P.* xxxiv. 4) holds that Hdt. ii. 50 means not that the Greeks had taken names of gods from Egypt but that they had learned from Egypt of gods already named there. T. B. Jones, *The Death of Numerian and the Accession of Diocletian*: the statement in some ancient authorities that N. died in Thrace is due to misunderstanding. Mary Johnston, *S.V.B.E.*: corrects Laidlaw (*C.P.* xxxiv. 3); the rarity of the formula *S.T.E.Q.V.B.E.* is not due to the rarity of letters to governors in their provinces.

## REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE

LXVI. 2: APRIL 1940

A. Aymard, *La Mort d'Antiochos, fils d'Antiochos III Mégas*. The death of Antiochus is placed by Livy in the summer of 193 and firmly embedded in his narrative of affairs in Asia for 194-193, which

are themselves connected at several points with his Roman chronology. But he is mentioned as if still alive in two cuneiform contracts of Sept. 193 and Jan. 192. A. argues against É. Cavaignac (*Rev. d'Assyriologie*, xxxv. 123) that it is easier to suppose ignorance or carelessness on the part of the scribes than a blunder by the historian. A. Levi, *Questioni platoniche*. I: Why did Plato maintain the dialogue form in his later works without the dialogue spirit? and why are his later dialogues thus more open than the earlier to the criticism made in the *Phaedrus* and *Seventh Letter* of all written composition? True discussion would take too long to arrive at positive conclusions, but the dialogue form is retained as a reminder of its necessity. II: The Platonic Socrates represents in the main Plato's development of Socratic ideas and methods, but the aesthetic and visionary intuition of Forms is not such a development but an entirely original factor. Yet Plato learnt from Socrates' methods how the Forms of which he had an intuition could be made the object of scientific thought, and therefore he did not hesitate to ascribe the whole complex to the Socrates of his dialogues. É. des Places, *Un livre nouveau sur les Lettres de Platon*, gives an account of G. Pasquali, *Le lettere di Platone*, who admits the authenticity of VI, VII, VIII (dated 350), and XI, and hesitates over X. P. Tryssier, *Notes de dialectologie bœotienne*: I. *λευς* (Att. *λέυς*), now learned to be the true reading of a Boeotian vase-inscription, shows intervocalic *y* changed, doubtless by way of a spirant *g*, to a *y*-sound, and allows us to explain *λέωρα* as *λεύωρα* *λέγωρα*. In another inscription (*S.E.G.* ii. 185) *μενύλλεο ερος* is to be interpreted as *μηνύλλεον ερός*. As *ἔνν* is unknown in Boeotian, T. suggests that this is a compound of *ἔννοια* and *λέγοι*. [? Read *μηνύλλεον λέγοι*.] II. *ταππαμάτα* (*I.G.* vii. 3172) is not to be read *τὰ ππάματα* with Buck, Bechtel, Schwyzer, &c., but as = *τὰ ἀππάματα* (= Attic *ἀνακτήματα*), cf. Corinna's *ἀππασάμενος*, glossed *ἀνακτημάτων*. III. *Ἐλικών* originally began with *ον*. Notes et Discussions: A. Ernout on A. Cordier, *I. Études sur le vocabulaire épique dans l'Énéide*. II. *L'allitération latine*, gives references for later use of words first appearing in Virgil, and concludes that he found the majority in existence and that, where he did innovate, his innovations were so much in accord with the genius of the language that they readily passed into the literary vocabulary.

## CORRESPONDENCE

## 'CAMPBELL'S AGAMEMNON IN ENGLISH'

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW  
Sirs—Ostensibly, I suppose, I ought to feel flattered upon finding in an

academic journal, *C.R.* liv. 83, the verb *to fust* included in a list of neologisms of mine, and described as 'not bad company' for some of the others, and those by no means the best even in the incomplete list there given.

But I am not flattered; I am shocked.

Few passages are so famous, even in the most famous of all Shakespeare's plays, as are those noble lines (upon our human faculty of 'large discourse' and 'godlike reason') in which this vigorous and most expressive verb is so effectively employed.

When Mr. Pickard-Cambridge combines so elementary a blunder with the disparagement of my poetic diction and the selection of two plays of Shakespeare as being by contrast appropriate models for the translator of Aeschylus, he is obviously somewhat unfortunate. But when he proceeds to his climax by requiring for this task 'a born poet' instead of such a shameless word-coiner, he is not only grossly inconsistent, he is urging the very fallacy against which it was precisely one of the main purposes of my translation to protest.

Neologism, in greater or less degree, is the mark of the born poet; the one thing above others that distinguishes him from the composer of class-room 'fair copies', to whom it is naturally abhorrent. *Tame and threadbare diction is the curse of our translations of Greek tragedy*; it remains the principal reason why even the least literal of them bear no real resemblance, after all, to those elaborate mosaics of hard, bright, variously shaped, and curiously compounded words. And of all Greek poets none was more notorious for neologism than Aeschylus.

Your reviewer treats this element as a defect; and as a defect of mine! I am—for that matter—a very minor poet, and my own style is accordingly devoid of neologism; *vid. e.g.* Binyon's extension of *The Golden Treasury*, Sir J. Squire's *Selections from Modern Poets*, L. Schücking's *Modern English Poetry*. Mr. Pickard-Cambridge could not of course have been expected to know that; but this does not excuse him; for the fact remains that the neologist element in my translation was intended

faithfully to reflect that element in the style of the original poet, and this is so obvious that how any scholarly reader could overlook it I simply cannot understand.

But Mr. P., when he has a mind to, can overlook anything. He says that in my translation he was often at a loss to 'find his place'. No wonder; let one example show why.

For representing the word *ἀλουργής* by 'marine product' my reasons were at least four: (1) precise English expression for choice Greek word, (2) variant on 'purple' corresponding to the poet's variant on *πορφύρα*—his other translators have only one word, and that the obvious—(3) passing glance at *ἔστιν θάλασσα*. To all such considerations as those three I am willing to believe that Mr. P. is honestly and by nature insensitive. But when he asserts that the words 'this marine product' are 'gratuitous additions' in the rendering of a line which contains *ἀλουργή*—when he will not even see that 'marine' represents *ἀλ-* and 'product' *-ουργ-*—from this and other evidence I must conclude, however reluctantly, that what conditioned his review was not so much an incapacity to understand as a refusal.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

Sirs—As regards 'fust' I apologize; I ought to have remembered a speech which I learned by heart fifty-five years ago. As for *ἀλουργή*, it is part of a line gratuitously inserted by Professor Campbell and not found in the text of Aeschylus; even if it were otherwise, I should still think 'marine product' prosaic. (It was for this that I criticized it.) For the rest, I am content that your readers should judge whether the translator's 'neologisms' have made his style Aeschylean, or secured the 'immediate and direct intelligibility to an audience' which he claims.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\*\*\* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

**Bates** (W. N.) Sophocles Poet and Dramatist. Pp. xiii+291; 6 plates, 4 figures. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press (London: Milford), 1940. Cloth, 21s. 6d. net.

**Björck** (G.) **HN ΔΙΔΑΣΚΩΝ.** Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen. Pp. 139. (Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenkaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, 32:2.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1940. Paper, 6 kr.

**Catholic University of America Patristic Studies.** Vol. LXIII. The Life and Times of Synesius of Cyrene as Revealed in His Works. By J. C. Pando. Pp. xix+186. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1940. Paper, \$2.

**David Ansell Slater** 1866-1938. Pp. 18. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXV.) London: Milford. Paper, 2s. net.

**Geary** (F. C.) Pelican Pie. Verses and Versions. Pp. viii+29. Oxford: Blackwell, 1940. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.

**Hesperia.** Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. IX: No. 3. Pp. 261-380; figures and plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1940. Paper.

**Hesperia:** Supplement IV. The Tholos of Athens and Its Predecessors. By H. A. Thompson. Pp. 160; 105 figures, 3 plans. Baltimore: American School of Classical Studies at Athens (Publication Office), 1940. Paper, \$5.

**Kennedy** (E. C.) Four Latin Authors. Extracts from Caesar, Vergil, Livy, and Ovid. Edited with Introductions, Notes and Vocabulary. Pp. xi+229. Cambridge: University Press, 1940. Cloth, 3s.

**Livingstone** (R. W.) Plato: Selected passages chosen and edited. Pp. xxiv+220. (The World's Classics, 487.) London: Milford. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

**Mattingly** (H.) Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum. Vol. IV: Antoninus Pius to Commodus. Pp. cc+964; 111 plates. London: British Museum, 1940. Cloth, £5 net.

**Nouum Testamentum Graece secundum textum Westcotto-Hortianum.** Euangelium secundum Matthaeum . . . edidit S. C. E. Legg. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Cloth, 25s. net.

**Stein** (Sir A.) Old Routes of Western Iran. Pp. xxviii+432; 112 illustrations; 31 plates; plans, sketch-plans, and maps. London: Macmillan, 1940. Cloth, 42s. net.

**Sturtevant** (E. H.) The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin. Second Edition. Pp. 192. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, University of Pennsylvania, 1940. Cloth, \$3.

**Syllage Nummorum Graecorum.** Vol. IV. Fitzwilliam Museum: Leake and General Collections. Part I: Spain (Emporiae, Rhoda)—Italy. Pp. iv; 15 plates and letterpress. London: Milford, 1940. Paper, 16s. net.

**Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.** Vol. LXX, 1939. Pp. vii+555+xli. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Lancaster Press (Oxford: Blackwell). Cloth.

**Watkins** (R. E.) A History of Paragraph Divisions in Horace's *Epistles*. Pp. 134. (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, No. X.) Paper, 1940. To be had from the author at Claremont, South Dakota, for \$2.75.

## INDEX

## I. GENERAL INDEX

actor, cantor, 72  
 Adams's *The Genuine Works of Hippocrates*, 112  
 Allan's *Plato: Republic, Book I*, 140. His translation of Stenzel's *Plato's Method of Dialectic*, 143  
 American Academy in Rome, *Memoirs* of (XVI), 103  
*American Journal of Philology* (LXI 1) summarized, 60  
 American Philological Association, *Transactions* of (LXIX) summarized, 61  
 Argenti's *The Bibliography of Chios*, 159  
 Armstrong's *The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus*, 195  
 Arnold's *Oorzaak en Schuld van den Tweeden Punischen Oorlog*, 42  
 Athenian tribute lists, 65  
 Atkinson's *Athenian Legislative Procedure*, 38  
 Augurs, formula of the, 44  
 Austin (R. G.) on Rackham's *Pliny, Natural History* (III), 200  
 avere, 134

Avi-Yonah's *Abbreviations in Greek Inscriptions*, 206  
 Bailey (C.) on Norden's *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern*, 44. On Turchi's *La Religione di Roma Antica*, 105  
 Barber (E. A.) on Waltz's Budé text of the Greek Anthology (III, IV), 17. On Bonazzi's *Proper-tius*, 29  
 Bardino's *L'Argenis di John Barclay*, 148  
 Barlow's *Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum*, 56  
 Beare (W.) The delivery of *Cantica* on the Roman stage, 70 ff.  
 Beede's *Vergil and Aratus*, 55  
 Beesley's *The Revival of the Humanities in American Education*, 216  
 Bell (H. I.) on Turner's *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri in the University of Aberdeen*, 46. On Premerstein's *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek*, V: 48. On Youtie and Pearl's *Tax Rolls from Karanis* (II), 115. On MacLennan's *Oxyrhynchus*, 174

Blomgren's *De sermone Ammiani Marcellini quaestiones*, 55  
 Bolkstein's *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum*, 106  
 Bonazzi's *Propertius*, 29  
 Bonner (S. F.) Three notes on the *Scripta Rhetorica* of Dionysius, 183  
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 62, 119, 176, 219  
 Botsford's *Hellenic History* (new edn.), 35  
 Bowra (C. M.) *Archilochus* fr. 56: 127  
 Box's *Philonis Alexandrini In Flaccum*, 170  
 Brazzel's *The Clausulae in the Works of St. Gregory the Great*, 56  
 Brink's *De Demokratie bij Demosthenes*, 57  
 Brommer's *ΕΛΔΟΣ et ΙΔΕΑ*, 192  
 Brunel's *L'aspect verbal et l'emploi des préverbes en grec*, 102  
 Buckler and Calder's *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* (VI), 59  
 Bullock's *Politics, Finance, and Consequences*, 105  
 Bury (R. G.) Two notes on Plato's *Laws*, 183  
 Bywater (L.) *Παραχράφις*, 10 ff.  
*Cambridge Ancient History*, The (XII), 41  
 Campbell's *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, 82 (cf. 217) *canticum*, 70  
*cantor, actor*, 72  
*Carmen Arvale*, 44  
 Cary (M.) on Brink's *De Demokratie bij Demosthenes*, 57  
 Cary's (E.) *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Roman Antiquities* (II), 145  
 Charanis's *Church and State in the Later Empire*, 208  
 Charlesworth (M. P.) on Frank's *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (IV), 107  
 Charlesworth's *Documents illustrating the reigns of Claudius and Nero*, 58  
 Classical Association, meeting of, 1, 65  
 Classical Association of Scotland, *Proceedings of, I Classical Philology* (XXXV 1-3) summarized, 61, 175, 217  
 Cochrane's *Christianity and Classical Culture*, 207  
 Colman (D. S.) on some class-books, 111  
 colour-blindness in Greece, 1  
 Colson's *Philo* (VIII), 170  
 Combellack's *Omitted Speech Formulas in Homer*, 215  
*contropabilis*, 172  
 Cook's *Zeus* (III), 209  
 Cooper's *Aristotelian Papers*, 88  
 Cordier's *Études sur le vocabulaire épique dans l'Enéide et L'Allitération latine*, 198  
 Crawford's *Greek and Latin*, 100  
 D'Alton's *Selections from St. John Chrysostom*, 197  
 David's *De Gnomologieën van Sint Gregorius van Nazianze*, 114  
 Dawkins (R. M.) on Argenti's *The Bibliography of Chios*, 159. On Jenkins's *Dionysius Solomós*, 160. On Paton's *The Venetians in Athens*, 173  
 Delatte's *Anecdota Atheniensia* (II), 150  
 De Leeuw's *Aelius Aristides*, 53  
 della Valle's *Breviario di poesia greca d'amore*, 169  
 Dibelius's *Paulus auf dem Areopag*, 114  
 Dinsmoor's *The Athenian Archon List*, 202  
*Dioniso* (vii 2-5), 1  
 Dipolieia, 212  
 Dodds (E. R.) on Morison's *The Ancient Classics in a Modern Democracy*, 112  
 Downey's *A Study of the Comites Orientis*, 58  
 ΔΡΑΓΜΑ Martino P. Nilsson dedicatum, 213  
*dru-* (Sanskrit prefix), 137  
 Duff (P. W.) on Wolff's *Written and Unwritten Marriages in Hellenistic and Postclassical Roman Law*, 59  
 Earp (F. R.) on Trevelyan's *Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound and Euripides, Medea*, and Fitts and Fitzgerald's *The Antigone of Sophocles*, 15. On Murray's *Aeschylus, The Persians*, 16  
 Earp's (C. B.) *A Study of the Fragments of Three Related Plays of Accius*, 54  
 Edmonds's *Some Greek Poems of Love and Wine*, 18  
 Eichholz (D. E.) *Plato Rp. 621a: 182*

elision at change of speakers, 152  
 Ennis's *The Vocabulary of the Institutions of Cassiodorus*, 172  
*Eranos* (XXXVII i-ii) summarized, 62  
 Erikson's *Sancti Epiphanius Episcopi Interpretatio Evangeliorum* and *Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Epiphanius' Interpretatio Evangeliorum*, 32  
 Ernout-Meillet's *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (ed. 2), 156  
 Farrington's *Science and Politics in the Ancient World*, 34  
 Fitts and Fitzgerald's *The Antigone of Sophocles*, 15  
 Fletcher (G. B. A.) on Spencer's *Celsus De Medicina* (II, III), 31. On Blomgren's *De sermone Ammiani Marcellini quaestiones*, 55. Assonances or plays on words in Tacitus, 184 ff.  
 Forbes (P. B. R.) on Brunel's *L'aspect verbal et l'emploi des préverbes en grec*, 102  
 Fordyce (C. J.) on Young's *Index Verborum Silianus*, 55. On Getty's *M. Annai Lucani De Bello Civili Lib. I*, 95. On Oldfather, Canter, and Abbott's *Index Verborum Ciceronis Epistularum*, 115  
 Forster (E. S.) on Soutar's *Nature in Greek Poetry*, 137  
 Forster's *Homer: Iliad XI*, 111  
 Fox's *The Life and Times of St. Basil the Great*, 53  
 Frank's *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (IV), 107  
 Fry's *Last Lectures*, 51  
 Fyfe's *Aristotle's Art of Poetry*, 193  
 Gallus and Horváth's *Un peuple préscythique en Hongrie*, 174  
 Gaselee (S.) on Edmonds's *Some Greek Poems of Love and Wine*, Way's *Greek Anthology* V-VII, and Lucas's *A Greek Garland*, 18. On *Index Breviarii Romani*, 117. On Todd's *Some Ancient Novels* and Bardino's *L'Argenis* di John Barclay, 148. On Thornton's *Ovid: Selected Works*, 151. On della Valle's *Breviario di poesia greca d'amore*, 169. On Marmorale's *Arusiani Messii Exempla Elocutionum* and Nelson's *Aeneae Silvii De liberorum educatione*, 173  
 Geraci's *Lucio Apuleio Madaurensis*, 55  
 Getty's *M. Annai Lucani De Bello Civili Lib. I*, 95  
 Giannelli's *Roma nell'Età delle Guerre puniche*, 161  
 Giarratano's *Taciti Historiarum Libri*, 171  
 Giles (A. F.) on Syme's *The Roman Revolution*, 38. On Radin's *Marcus Brutus*, 164. On McDonald's *The Rise of Roman Imperialism*, 216  
*gnomon*, 181  
 Goldmann (E.) on Shaw's *Etruscan Perugia*, 117  
 Gomme (A. W.) on Smits's *Plutarchus' Leven van Lysander*, 23. On Botsford's *Hellenic History* (new edn.), 35. On Atkinson's *Athenian Legislative Procedure*, 38. Two notes on the Athenian tribute lists, 65 ff. On Parke's *A History of the Delphic Oracle*, 158. On Morrow's *Plato's Law of Slavery*, 204  
 Goodenough's *The Politics of Philo Judaeus*, 147  
 Gow (A. S. F.) on Fry's *Last Lectures*, 51  
 Greene's *Scholia Platonica*, 142  
 Griffith (G. T.) on Schlapfer's *Untersuchungen zu den Attischen Staatsurkunden*, 174  
 Guthrie (W. K. C.) on Farrington's *Science and Politics in the Ancient World*, 34. On Buckler and Calder's *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* (VI), 59  
 Halliwell's *The Style of Pope St. Leo the Great*, 201  
 Hamilton (W.) on Walzer's *Eracito*, 112  
 Hanell's *Aus der Papyrussammlung der Universitätsbibliothek in Lund*, III, 47  
 Härleman's *De Claudiano Mamerto quaestiones*, 56  
 Harrison (A. R. W.) on Roussel's *Sparte*, 36  
 Harrison (E.) on Jaeger's *Paideia* (English translation), 32. On Moore's *The Romans in Britain*, 109. On Helmhold's *Plutarch's Moralia* (VI), 146. On Strzelecki's *De Seneca tri metro iambico quaestiones*, 152. On Laurand's *Pour mieux comprendre l'antiquité classique* (II) and *Yale Classical Studies* (VI), 168. On Peppink's *Athenaei Dipnosophis*

tarum Epitome (II), 170. On Combellack's *Omitted Speech Formulas in Homer*, 215  
*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* (L), summarized 118  
*heliotropium*, 181  
*Helmbold's Plutarch's Moralia* (VI), 146  
*Henderson* (M. I.) on Sutherland's *The Romans in Spain*, 43  
*Hendrickson's Cicero, Brutus*, 89  
*Henry* (R. M.) on Schelkle's *Virgil in der Deutung Augustins*, 27. On Stam's *Prudentius, Hamartigena*, 154. On Cochrane's *Christianity and Classical Culture*, 207  
*Hermathena* (LIII-LV), summarized, 60, 175  
*Hess's Textkritische und erklärende Beiträge zum Epitaphios des Hypereides*, 21  
*Heurtley's Prehistoric Macedonia*, 156  
*Hight* (G.) on Reitzenstein's *Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Propertz*, 199  
*Hight's translation of Jaeger's Paideia*, 32  
*Hill* (G.) on Otto's *Handbuch der Archäologie* (iii), 49  
*Homer*, humour in, 121  
*Horace's sapphics*, 131  
*Hritz's The Style of the Letters of St. Jerome*, 201  
*Hubbell's Cicero, Orator*, 89  
*Hudson* (A. E. L.) on Schnabel's *Text und Karten des Ptolemaeus*, 25  
*Index Breviarum Romani*, 117  
*Inge* (W. R.) Two notes on Lucretius, 188  
*interpuncta*, 78  
*Jaeger's Paideia* (English translation), 32  
*Jeanmaire's Courtoi et Courteuses*, 37  
*Jenkins* (C.) on Fox's *The Life and Times of St. Basil the Great*, 53. On Rapisarda's *Teofilo di Antiochia*, 54  
*Jenkins's (R.) Dionysius Solomós*, 160  
*Johnson's Compositiones Variae* from Lucca MS. 490: 57  
*Jolliffe's The Critical Methods and Influence of Bentley's Horace*, 28  
*Jones's (C. W.) Bedae Pseudopigrapha*, 57  
*Jones's (F. P.) The ab urbe condita Construction in Greek*, 115  
*Jones's (L. W.) Studies in Honor of E. K. Rand*, 155  
*Judge and Porter's Latin Prose Composition*, 111  
*Kitto* (H. D. F.) on Murray's *Aeschylus, the Creator of Tragedy*, 81  
*Kitto's Greek Tragedy*, 79  
*Klibansky's The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition*, 169  
*Knight's Accidental Symmetry in Vergil*, 93  
*Laguerre's La Vie des Romains*, 110  
*Laistner's Bedae Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractatio*, 115  
*Laurand's Pour mieux comprendre l'antiquité classique* (II), 168  
*Leon's Plato*, 87  
*Levy's A Latin Reader for Colleges*, 111  
*Livingstone* (R. W.) on Beesley's *The Revival of the Humanities in American Education*, 216  
*Loader* (W. R.) Pompey's command under the Lex Gabinia, 134 ff.  
*Lockwood* (J. F.) on Vogel's *The Major MSS. of Cicero's De Senectute*, 54  
*Loeb Classical Library*: *Celsus* (II, III), 31; *Cicero, Brutus and Orator*, 89; *Demosthenes, Private Orations* (III), 113; *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Roman Antiquities* (II), 145; *History of Greek Mathematics* (I), 149; *Nommos*, 188; *Philo* (VIII), 170; *Pliny, Natural History* (III), 200; *Plutarch, Moralia* (VI), 146  
*Lorimer* (H. L.) on Valmin's *The Swedish Messenia Expedition*, 50  
*Lorimer* (W. L.) on De Leeuw's *Aelius Aristides*, 53. *Punctum*, 77. On Allan's *Plato: Republic, Book I*, 140. On Greene's *Scholia Platonica*, 142. On Klibansky's *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition*, 169. On Müller's *Das Verhältnis von Apuleius De Mondo zu seiner Vorlage*, 171. On Simensky's *Elemente De Sintaxi Grecā*, 175  
*Avrapxla*, 187. On D'Alton's *Selections from St. John Chrysostom*, 197  
*Lucas* (D. W.) on McPeek's *Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain*, 93  
*Lucas's (F. L.) A Greek Garland*, 18  
*Lucretius*, date of death of, 72  
*Lutz's Iohannis Scotti Annotationes in Marcianum*, 116  
*McDonald* (A. H.) on Arnold's *Oorzaak en Schuld van den Tweeden Punische Oorlog*, 42. On Cary's *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Roman Antiquities* (II), 145  
*McDonald's The Rise of Roman Imperialism*, 216  
*MacLennan's Oxyrhynchus*, 174  
*McPeek's Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain*, 93  
*Maidment* (K. J.) on Weber's *Solon und die Schöpfung der attischen Grabrede*, 85. On Mathieu and Brémond's Budé text of Isocrates (II), 86  
*Manni's Lucio Sergio Catilina*, 162  
*Manson* (T. W.) on Dibelius's *Paulus auf dem Areopag*, 114. On Schmidt's *Die Polis in Kirche und Welt*, 170  
*Marchant* (E. C.) on Giarratano's *Taciti Historiarum Libri*, 171  
*Marmorale's Arusiani Messii Exempla Elocutionum*, 173  
*Mathieu and Brémond's Budé text of Isocrates* (II), 86  
*Mattingly* (H.) on Laguerre's *La Vie des Romains*, 110  
*Méautis's Les Chefs-d'œuvre de la Peinture grecque*, 104  
*Meerdink's Ariadne*, 104  
*Meiggs* (R.) on Bolkestein's *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum*, 106. On Tanzer's *The Common People of Pompeii*, 117. On Manni's *Lucio Sergio Catilina*, 162  
*Merckx's Zur Syntax der Kasus und Tempora in den Traktaten des hl. Cyprian*, 172  
*Merlan's Platons Form der philosophischen Mitteilung*, 53  
*Middelmann's Griechische Welt und Sprache in Plautus' Komödien*, 26  
*Milne* (J. G.) *Παραχάραξις*, 12  
*Minns* (E. H.) on Robinson's *MSS. 27 and 107 of the Municipal Library of Autun*, 103  
*Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* (VI), 59  
*Moore's The Romans in Britain*, 109  
*Moorhouse* (A. C.) *Greek IYNH, English Kin*, 187  
*Moreau's La Construction de l'Idéalisme platonicien et L'âme du Monde de Platon aux Stoïciens*, 22  
*Morel* (W.) *Passio SS. Machabaeorum* 5. 28: 13  
*Morison's The Ancient Classics in a Modern Democracy*, 112  
*Morrow's Plato's Law of Slavery*, 204  
*Mountford* (J. F.) on van Krevelen's *Philodemus—De Muzie*, 26  
*Mozley* (J. H.) on Jones's *Bedae Pseudopigrapha*, 57  
*Müller's (K. A.) Claudians Festgedicht auf das sechste Konsulat des Kaisers Honorius*, 98  
*Müller's (S.) Das Verhältnis von Apuleius De Mondo zu seiner Vorlage*, 171  
*Murphy* (N. R.) on Percival's *Aristotle on Friendship*, 144  
*Murray's (A. T.) Demosthenes, Private Orations* (III), 113  
*Murray's (G.) Aeschylus, The Persians*, 16. His *Aeschylus, the Creator of Tragedy*, 81. His *Stoic, Christian and Humanist*, 214  
*Myitors* (R. A. B.) on *Studies in Honor of E. K. Rand*, 155  
*Myrdes* (J. L.) on Rostovtzeff, Brown, and Welles's *The Excavations at Dura-Europos*, 117. Plutarch, *Solon* 24: 130. On Heurtley's *Prehistoric Macedonia*, 156. On Gallus and Horváth's *Un peuple préscythique en Hongrie*, 174  
*Myres* (J. N. L.) on Charanis's *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire*, 208  
*Nelson's Aeneae Silvii De liberorum educatione*, 173  
*Nilsson* (M. P.) studies in honour of (ΔΡΑΓΜΑ), 213

Nisbet (R. G.) on Hendrickson's *Cicero, Brutus, and Hubbell's Cicero, Orator*, 89

Nisbet's *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Domo Sua oratio*, 91

Nock (A. D.) on Goodenough's *The Politics of Philo Judaeus*, 147. On Box's *Philonis Alexandrini In Flaccum and Colson's Philo* (VIII), 170

nomina sacra, 206

Norberg's *In Registrum Gregorii Magni studia critica* (II), 172

Norden's *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern*, 44

numerus, 169

Oellacher's *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, N.S. III: 47

Oldfather, Canter, and Abbott's *Index Verborum Ciceronis Epistularum*, 115

Otto's *Handbuch der Archäologie* (iii), 49

Owen's *Euripiades*, *Ion*, 84

Palmer (L. R.) on Schwyzer's *Griechische Grammatik* (ii), 101

papyri, 46, 47, 48, 115

Parke's *A History of the Delphic Oracle*, 158

Parker (H. M. D.) on The Cambridge Ancient History (XII), 41. On Downey's *A Study of the Comites Orientis*, 58

Paton's *The Venetians in Athens*, 173

Peck (A. L.) on Adams's *The Genuine Works of Hippocrates*, 112

Peppink's *Athenaei Dipnosophistarum Epitome* (II), 170

Percival's *Aristotle on Friendship*, 144

Phrixus, flight of, 1

Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.) on Campbell's *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, 82 (cf. 217). On Cooper's *Aristotelian Papers*, 88. On Thompson's *Science and the Classics*, 166. On Rouse, Rose, and Lind's *Nonnos*, 188. On Fyfe's *Aristotle's Art of Poetry*, 193. On Cook's *Zeus* (III), 209

Pirie (J. W.) on Erikson's *Sancti Epiphanius Episcopi Interpretatio Evangeliorum et Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Epiphanius' Interpretatio Evangeliorum* 32. On Härleman's *De Claudiano Mamerto quaestiones*, 56. On Crawford's *Greek and Latin*, 100. On Enroot-Meillet's *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (ed. 2), 156. On Ennis's *The Vocabulary of the Institutions of Cassiodorus*, Merkx's *Zur Syntax der Kasus und Tempora in den Traktaten des hl. Cyprian*, and Norberg's *In Registrum Gregorii Magni studia critica* (II), 172. On Hritz's *The Style of the Letters of St. Jerome and Halliwell's The Style of Pope St. Leo the Great*, 201

poema, 75 f.

poritor, 6

Powell (J. E.) Greek timekeeping, 69 (cf. 180)

Powell's *Herodotus, Book VIII*, 19

Poynton (J. B.) Two notes on the *Thebaid* of Statius, 13

Premesterin's *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek* (V), 48

proba ('sample'), 156

punctum, 77

Rackham's *Pliny, Natural History* (III), 200

Radin's *Marcus Brutus*, 164

Rand (E. K.) *Studies in Honour of*, 155

Rapisarda's *Teofilo di Antiochia*, 54

Reitzenstein's *Wirklichkeitsbund und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz*, 199

Rennie (W.) on Hess's *Texthriatische und erklärende Beiträge zum Epitaphios des Hypereides*, 21

Revue de Philologie (LXVI 1, 2) summarized, 119, 217

Robertson (D. S.) The flight of Phrixus, 1. On Geraci's *Lucio Apuleio Madaurensis*, 55. On Owen's *Euripiades*, *Ion*, 84. On Murray's *Demosthenes, Private Orations* (III), 113. Valerius Flaccus i 10: 133. On Silver's *The Pindaric Odes of Ronsard*, 138. The food of Achilles, 177 ff. The evidence for Greek timekeeping, 180 f.

Robertson (M.) on Webster and Charlton's *Some Unpublished Greek Vases*, 59. On Méautis's *Les Chefs-d'œuvre de la Peinture grecque*, 104

Robertson's (P.) *Latin Prose Composition*, 111

Robinson's (C. A.) new edn. of Botsford's *Hellenic History*, 35

Robinson's (R. P.) MSS. 27 and 107 of the *Municipal Library of Autun*, 103

Rose (H. J.) on Jeamaire's *Couvoi et Courètes*, 37. Aristophanes *Birds* 1122: 79 (cf. 188). On Meerdink's *Ariadne*, 104

Rostovtzeff, Brown, and Welles's *The Excavations at Dura-Europos*, 117

Rouse's *Achilles and the Great Quarrel at Troy*, 52

Rouse, Rose, and Lind's *Nonnos*, 188

Roussel's *Sparte*, 36

Sandbach (F. H.) *Lucreti Poemata* and the poet's death, 72 ff. On Cordier's *Études sur le vocabulaire épique dans l'Énéide et L'Allitération latine*, 198

sapphic metre, accentual rhythm in, 131

Sartain (W. J.) on Bullock's *Politics, Finance, and Consequences*, 105

Schelkle's *Virgil in der Deutung Augustins*, 27

Schläpfer's *Untersuchungen zu den attischen Staatsurkunden*, 174

Schmidt's *Die Polis in Kirche und Welt*, 170

Schnabel's *Text und Karten des Ptolemäus*, 25

Schwyzer's *Griechische Grammatik* (II), 101

Scullard (H. H.) on Westington's *Atrocities in Roman Warfare*, 58. On Giannelli's *Roma nell'Età delle Guerre puniche*, 161

semones, 45

Semple (W. H.) on Müller's *Claudians Festgedicht auf das sechste Konsulat des Kaisers Honorius*, 98

Seneca's iambics, 152

Shaw's *Etruscan Perugia*, 117

Sherwin-White (A. N.) on Vogt's *Kaiser Julian und das Judentum*, 118

Shewring (W. H.) on Brazzel's *The Clausulae in the Works of St. Gregory the Great*, 56

Sikes (E. E.) The humour of Homer, 121 ff.

Sikes (J. G.) on Laistner's *Beda Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractatio*, 115. On Lutz's *Iohannis Scotti Annotations in Marcianum*, 116

Silver's *The Pindaric Odes of Ronsard*, 138

Simenschy's *Elementa De Sintaxā Greacā*, 175

Skutsch (O.) on Earp's *A Study of the Fragments of Three Related Plays of Accius*, 54. On Knight's *Accentual Symmetry in Vergil*, 93

Slaughter's *Calabria the First Italy*, 205

Sleeman (J. H.) on Armstrong's *The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus*, 195

Smits's *Plutarchus' Leven van Lysander*, 23

Soutar's *Nature in Greek Poetry*, 137

Souter (A.) on Barlow's *Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum*, 56. On Johnson's *Compositio Variae* from Lucca MS. 490: 57

South African Architectural Record (Nov. 1939), 1

Spencer's *Celsus De Medicina* (II, III), 31

Stam's *Prudentius, Hamartigenia*, 154

Stanford (W. B.) Three-word iambic trimeters in Greek Tragedy, 8. Early three-word iambic trimeters, 187

Stanford's *Ambiguity in Greek Literature*, 14

Stein's *Old Routes of Western Iran*, 215

Stenzel's *Plato's Method of Dialectic* (tr. Allan), 143

Stevenson (G. H.) on Charlesworth's *Documents illustrating the reigns of Claudius and Nero*, 58

Stevenson (J.) on Turner's *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumeta Iuris Antiquissima* (II 2, 4, II 3), 116

Strömberg's *Theophrastea*, 195

Strzelecki's *De Senecae trimetro iambico quaestiones*, 152

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 60, 118, 175, 217.

sundials in Greece, 69, 180

Sutherland's *The Romans in Spain*, 43

Symbolae Osloenses (XIX) summarized, 118

Syme's *The Roman Revolution*, 38

Tacitus, assonances or plays on words in, 184

Tanzer's *The Common People of Pompeii*, 117

Tarn (W. W.) on Dinsmoor's *The Athenian Archon List*, 202. On Stein's *Old Routes of Western Iran*, 215

Tarrant (D.) on Moreau's *La Construction de l'Idéalisme platonicien et L'Âme du Monde de Platon aux Stoïciens*, 22. On Leon's *Plato*, 87. On Vink's *Plato's Eerste Alcibiades*, 140. On Murray's *Stoic, Christian and Humanist*, 214.

Tate (J.) on Wijnberg's *Antiphons Eerste Rede*, 20. On Merlan's *Platons Form der philosophischen Mitteilung*, 53. On Vourveris's 'H ἔθνη συνεδρίου τοῦ Πλάτωνος καὶ παιδεία κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα', and Wilcox's *The Destructive Hypothetical Syllogism*, 113. On Davids's *De Gnomologien van Sint Gregorius van Nazianze*, 114. On Jones's *The ab urbe condita Construction in Greek*, 115. On Stenzel's *Plato's Method of Dialectic*, 143. On Terzaghi's *Synesii Cyrenensis Hymni*, 191. On Brommer's *ΕΙΔΟΣ et ΙΔΕΑ*, 192. On ΔΡΑΓΜΑ Μαρτίνο Π. Nilsson dedicatum, 213.

Terzaghi's *Synesii Cyrenensis Hymni*, 191.

Thomas's *Selections illustrating the History of Greek Mathematics* (I), 149.

Thompson (D'A. W.) on Thomas's *Selections illustrating the History of Greek Mathematics* (I), 149. On Delatte's *Anecdota Atheniensia* (II), 150. Aristophanes' *Birds* 1122: 188. On Strömberg's *Theophrastea*, 195.

Thompson's *Science and the Classics*, 166.

Thomson (J. A. K.) on Stanford's *Ambiguity in Greek Literature*, 14.

Thornton's *Ovid: Selected Works*, 151.

Todd's *Some Ancient Novels*, 148.

Tredennick (H.) on Middelmann's *Griechische Welt und Sprache in Plautus' Komödien*, 26. On Weissinger's *A Study of Act Divisions in Classical Drama*, 139.

Trevelyan's *Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound and Euripides, Medea*, 15.

Treves (P.) on Powell's *Herodotus, Book VIII*, 19.

Turchi's *La Religione di Roma Antica*, 165.

Turner's (C. B.) *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* (I ii 2, II 3), 116.

Turner's (E. G.) *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri in the University of Aberdeen*, 46.

Ure (P. N.) on Slaughter's *Calabria the First Italy*, 205.

Valmin's *The Swedish Messenia Expedition*, 50.

van Krevelen's *Philodemus—De Musiek*, 26.

Vink's *Plato's Eerste Alcibiades*, 140.

Vogel's *The Major MSS. of Cicero's De Senectute*, 54.

Vogt's *Kaiser Julian und das Judentum*, 118.

Vourveris's 'H ἔθνη συνεδρίου τοῦ Πλάτωνος and Κάρος καὶ παιδεία κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα', 113.

vultum fingere, 13.

Waddell (W. G.) on Rainer and Lund Papyri, 47.

On Rouse's *Achilles and the Great Quarrel at Troy*, 52.

Waltz's Budé text of the Greek Anthology (III, IV), 17.

Walzer's *Eraclito*, 112.

Watkins's *A History of Paragraph Divisions in Horace's Epistles*, 215.

Way (J. A. H.) on Beede's *Vergil and Aeneas*, 55.

Way's (A. S.) *Greek Anthology V–VII*: 18.

Weber's *Solon und die Schöpfung der attischen Grabrede*, 85.

Webster and Charlton's *Some Unpublished Greek Vases*, 59.

Weissinger's *A Study of Act Divisions in Classical Drama*, 139.

Westington's *Atrocities in Roman Warfare*, 58.

Wijnberg's *Antiphon's Eerste Rede*, 20.

Wilcox's *The Destructive Hypothetical Syllogism*, 113.

Wilkinson (L. P.) on Jolliffe's *The Critical Methods and Influence of Bentley's Horace*, 28. Accentual rhythm in Horatian sapphics, 131. On Watkins's *A History of Paragraph Divisions in Horace's Epistles*, 215.

Winnington-Ingram (R. P.) on Kitto's *Greek Tragedy*, 79.

Wolf's *Written and Unwritten Marriages in Hellenistic and Postclassical Roman Law*, 59.

Woodcock (E. C.) on Nisbet's *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Domo Sua Oratio*, 91.

Woodward (A. M.) on Avi-Yonah's *Abbreviations in Greek Inscriptions*, 206.

Yale Classical Studies (VI), 168.

Young's *Index Verborum Silianus*, 55.

Youtie and Pearl's *Tax Rolls from Karanis* (II), 115.

## II. INDEX LOCORUM

Note:—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given place.

*Acta Alexandrinorum* passim: 48.

*Aelian VH* ix 2: 188.

Aeschylus passim: 8 ff. *A.* passim: 83. *Dan. fr.* 44 N<sup>o</sup>: 134. *Eu.* 651: 179. *Pers.* passim: 16. *Supp.* 525, 593: 211.

Agatharchides *de mari erythr.* 7: 4.

Amianus Marcellinus passim: 56; xxi 16 21: 156.

*Anthologia Latina* 211 204, 408 25 f.: 6.

*Anthologia Palatina* vi, vii passim: 17; ix 215: 8; x 90: 19.

Antiphon i 8, 17, 26: 21.

Apollodorus *Bibl.* i 9: 1.

Apollonius Rhodius passim: 7.

Appian *Mithr.* 94: 135.

Apuleius *De Mundo* passim: 171. *Met.* vi. 29: 6.

Archilochus fr. 56 (Diehl): 127.

Aristophanes *Ach.* 197: 103. *Av.* 1122: 79, 188. *Daidaleis* fr. 180. *Ecl.* 652: 69. *Fr.* 163: 69, 180. *Ra.* 839: 9. *Ve.* 1405: 22. *Schol. Av.* 997: 69.

Aristotle *EN* 1166a 14: 144. *HA* 486b: 167. *Po.* passim: 193; 1457b 2: 89; 1457b 7: 198. *Rh.* 1412a 32 ff. 1417b 16 ff.: 89. *Fr.* 156 (Rose): 69.

Augustine *De Civ. Dei* i 2: 28. *De Div. Quaest.* lxxxiii 64 7: 27. *De mor. eccl. cath.* 28 55: 28.

Ausonius *Id.* 12 pr.: 77 f.

*Carmen Arvale*, 45.

Cassiodorus *Inst.* passim: 172.

Catullus xxii: 76.

Celsus *De Med.* v–viii passim: 31.

Cicero *Dom.* passim: 91. *Brutus* passim: 90. *De Or.* ii 177: 77. *Orat.* 36: 198. *De Div.* i 66: 75. *De Fin.* iv 7: 78. *Par.* pr. 2: 77. *Tim.* 8: 134. *Tusc.* i 106–7: 71; ii 26: 57. *Att.* i 16 18: 76; iv 1 7: 135; xv 11 4: 134. *QF* ii 8 1: 76; 9 3: 75.

Claudian *VI Cons. Hon.* passim: 99.

Demosthenes *Conon* i: 113. *Lept.* 139: 38. *Neaera* 78: 113. *Timocr.* 33: 38.

Dio Cassius xxxvi 36a: 134; lvi 29: 74.

Dio Chrysostom *Or.* vii 6: 128.

Diodorus Siculus iv 47: 4, 7.

Diogenes Laertius ii 1: 69; vi 2 20, 21: 10.

Dionysius Halicarnassensis *Ant. Rom.* i 41: 76; iii, iv passim: 145. *De Comp.* 6: 184; 22: 10. *De Dem.* 13: 183. *De Lys.* 1: 184; 6: 183; 21: 184. *Ep. ad Amm.* i 2: 184.

Donatus *vit. Verg.*: 72 f.

[Eratosthenes] *Catasterismi* 19: 4.

Eubulus ap. Athen. i 8: 69.

[Eudocia] *Violarium* 478: 5.

Euripides passim: 9 f. *Heracl.* 655 ff.: 114. *Ion* passim: 84; i: 153. *Med.* 1189: 184. *Or.* 140: 184.

Eusebius *Ol.* 171 3: 72.

Galen viii p. 583 Kühn, 584: 11.

Herodotus ii 109 3: 70, 180; viii passim: 19.

Hipparchus *In Arati et Eudoxi Phaen. Comm.* i 3 6, 4 8, 9 8: 181.

Homer *Il.* i 493 ff.: 121; iv 275 ff., v 522 ff.

xvii 243: 129. *Od.* iv 500 ff.: 128. *Schol. Il.* x 252: 69; xvi 37: 177  
 Horace *passim*: 29. *AP* 155: 72; 295: 215. *C. i* 6 1-2: 96  
*Hyginus Fab.* 3: 6  
*Hyperides Epilaophios* *passim*: 20  
*IG* i<sup>2</sup> 196: 65; 198, 372 2: 66; ii<sup>2</sup> 791: 203  
*Isocrates* xi 97: 205. *Evag.* 66, 79, *Plat.* 18, 19 i: 87  
*Joannes Chrysostomus* *passim*: 197  
*Juvenal* vi, 01-34: 213  
*Livy* vii 2: 70  
*Lucan* i *passim*: 96; iv 57: 6  
*Lucian Astrol.* 14: 4. *Scytha* 8: 130  
*Lucilius* 338 M: 75  
*Lucretius* i 1 ff.: 76 f.; 250 f.: 134; ii 40: 188; iii 957: 134; v 1188 ff.: 188  
*Manilius* iv 514 ff.: 744 ff., v 32 f.: 5  
*Martial* ix 7: 6  
*Nonnus* *passim*: 188; x 99 ff.: 4  
*Ovid Am.* i 5, i 11, i 12: 200; i 15 23: 75; ii 12: 200. F. iii 867 ff.: 5. *Her.* 13: 199; 18 143 ff.: 5. *ib.* 427 f., 515 f.: 178  
*Palaephatus Perὶ ἀπίστων* 30: 4  
*Passio SS. Machabaeorum* 5 28: 13  
*Pausanias* ii 9: 188 (cf. 79); x 15 7: 179  
*Persius* 5 30 ff.: 74  
*Phaedrus* v 3 3: 78  
*Philo De Virt.* 28, *De Praem.* 29: 170  
*Philostratus Her.* xx 2: 180. *Imag.* ii 15: 4  
*Pindar N.* iii 34, 48 f.: 179; 50 ff., 56 ff.: 180; ix 39: 129. O. iii 16 ff.: 179. P. iii 27 ff.: 179; iv 159 ff.: 7; v 57 ff., ix 41 ff.: 179  
*Plato Comicus* fr. (FCG Meineke ii p. 643): 11  
*Plato Ale.* i 1111: 140. *Epist.* viii 342: 192. *Euthyphro* 5d, 6d: 192. *Lg.* 629c: 193: 824a: 183; 845c, 954e: 204; 960b: 183. *Phd.* 99b 4: 167; 100b: 193. *Phlb.* 48d: 141. *Rp.* i *passim*: 141; 596ab: 192; 597b 14: 193; 616e: 167; 621a: 182. *Theag.* 130b: 141

*Plautus Pseud.* 366: 72. *Stich.* 761-2, 771: 71  
*Pliny NH* viii-xi *passim*: 200; viii 111: 200; 201: 78; xi 73 and 100: 78; xxx 19: 178; 136: 78  
*Pliny Pan.* 35 3: 78  
*Plotinus* *passim*: 196  
*Plutarch De Aud.* 9: 184. *Mor.* 439a-523b *passim*: 146. *Dio* 29: 181. *Lys.* *passim*: 24. *Pomp.* 25: 135. *Sol.* 22, 24, 31: 130  
*Polybius* iii 6, 21, 32: 42  
*Propertius* *passim*: 29; ii 14 and 15: 200; 26 1 ff.: 8; 34 71 ff.: 75; iii 23: 200; iv 3: 199  
*Prudentius Ham.* *passim*: 154  
*Quintilian I.O.* i 2 14, 8 10: 76  
*Quintus Smyrnaeus* xiv 568 ff.: 128  
*Seneca Epp.* 82 9 f. and 23 1: 78; 89 4: 168. *Ag.* 794: 152 f.; 795: 154; 970: 152. *HF* 1009: 153. *HO* 892: 152. *Med.* 447: 153. *Oct.* 457: 152, 154. *Thy.* 850 f. 6. *Tro.* 607: 154; 1034 ff.: 6  
*Simoniades* fr. 87 4: 129  
*Sophocles* *passim*: 9 f. *Ai.* 1101: 153  
*Status Ach.* ii 96 ff.: 177. *Silv.* v 2: 74. *Theb.* i 684: 13; 693: 6; v 475: 6; vii 12 f.: 134; viii 758 ff.: 178; xi 239 ff.: 13  
*Strabo* iii 2 6: 43; x 1 12: 129  
*Synesius Hymn.* *passim*: 191  
*Tacitus* *passim*: 184. *Hist.* i 78: 43  
*Theognis* 19: 33  
*Theophrastus Sign.* *Temp.* 3 8: 127  
*Thucydides* *passim*: 67  
*Valerius Flaccus* i 10, 100: 133; 281 ff.: 5; 485: 134; ii 123: 134; v 184 ff.: 5  
*Valerius Maximus* ii 4: 70; viii 159: 135  
*Varro LL* viii 8: 44  
*Velleius Paterculus* ii 31: 134  
*Virgil Aen.* i 174, vii 689: 199; xi 259 f.: 128; xii 386: 198. *Geo.* i 32: 167; 98: 166; ii 325 ff.: 134; iv 493: 155  
*Vitruvius* ii 8 10, ix 6 3, 8 1: 181; ix 9 1: 69

## III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

αῖολος, 210	έγγρόσις, 59	κόσμος, 89, 155	πολέμοιο μέφος, 129
ἀκανθοπλήξ, 194	εἴδος, ίδεα, 192	Κουρῆτες, κούροι, 37	πόλος, 69, 180
άκρα, 129	Ἐλληνες 'pagans', 19	κρήγυνος, 140	πόρρωθεν, 170
ἀπόταξις, 67, 68	ἔξωτερικοι λόγοι, 194	λεπτός, 183	σκιόθρον, 69
ἀρρηφόροι, 211	έρσηφόροι, 211	Λουτροφόρος, 211	στοιχέων, 69
ἀσθμαίνειν, 179	εὐφόρον, 19	μακρόθεν, 170	σφργίς, 33
αὐταρχία, 187	Ἡλιοπολῖται, 107	μεταχαράτεν, 12	τάττ-ειν, -εσθαι, in assess- ments, 67
Βουτύντοι, Βουθόντα, 212	ἡλιοτρόπιον, 69, 180 f.	νάρκισσος, 137, 167	νάκινθος, 190
γαυμόχος, 210	θρήνος, 16	νόμισμα, 12	ὑποχαράττεν, 11
γένος, 187	ιδέα, εἶδος, 192	παραγράφειν, -κόπτειν, -σε- σημασμένον, -σημεῖον,	φλέψ, 195
γνώμων, 69, 181	ἴς, 195	-σημειούσθαι, -σημον,	χαρακτήρ, 10
γραφή παρανόμων, 38	ἴνγκ, 167	-σφραγίσαι, -τυπούσθαι,	χαράττεν τὸ νόμισμα, 10
γυνή and κίν, 187	κάθαροις, 194	-χάραξις, -χαράττεν,	χωρικαὶ λειτουργίαι, 46
Γυράς, Γυρέων ἄκρα, 128	καταλογή, παρακαταλογή,	10 ff.	ώρα, 182
δημοπολῆτος, 130	71	ποίημα, ποίησις, 75 f.	ώρολόγιον, 69
δόροι, δρυμά, δρός, δρυτό- μος, 137	κεφεληγερέταν, 210		
	κέδωρος, 194		

: 78;

sim:

25:

1 ff.:

794:

HO

154-

684:

8 ff.:

134;

386:

4; iv

sess-

, 10

46



## A GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON

Compiled by H. G. LIDDELL and R. SCOTT

### A NEW EDITION

Revised and augmented throughout by Sir HENRY STUART JONES and R. MCKENZIE with the co-operation of many scholars.

Two volumes. Pp. 2160. £5. 5s. net

The separate sale of parts will be discontinued from 1 April 1941

'In its new form it is *the* Greek lexicon, and one of the best dictionaries ever made.' Prof. P. MAAS in the *Oxford Magazine*.

## AESCHYLUS: THE CREATOR OF TRAGEDY

By GILBERT MURRAY. Pp. 254. 7s. 6d. net

'The most penetrating, the most suggestive, and the most complete interpretation of Aeschylus that any scholar has yet given us.' G. M. YOUNG in the *Observer*.

## THE ROMAN REVOLUTION

By R. SYME. Pp. 580, with 7 genealogical tables. 21s. net

'The best book on Roman history that has appeared for many years.' *Spectator*.

## THE ROMAN CITIZENSHIP

By A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE. Pp. 324. 15s. net

'It fulfils the long-standing need of a single comprehensive survey of the Roman *civitas* and of the stages by which it developed from a purely local conception into a thorough-going article of empire. . . . It is a remarkably solid book, well planned and well executed.' *Times Literary Supplement*.

## THE GREEK CITY

from Alexander to Justinian

By A. H. M. JONES. Pp. 404. 21s. net

A companion volume to *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, by the same author, 35s. net

'A work of penetrative scholarship of the first order. . . . We are compelled to admiration and gratitude.' *Times Literary Supplement*.

## CHRISTIANITY AND CLASSICAL CULTURE

A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine

By C. N. COCHRANE. Pp. 534. 30s. net

'A book of profound knowledge and great literary charm, with much light to throw on subsequent European culture, including that of to-day.' *British Weekly*.

**OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

# The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.

E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D. W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

Each volume Foolscape 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

"We shall never be independent of our Loeb."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

NEW VOLUMES, AUTUMN AND WINTER 1939-40

## LATIN

352, 353 PLINY. NATURAL HISTORY. Ten volumes; Vol. II, Books III-VII; Vol. III, Books VIII-XI. Translated by H. Rackham.

359 REMAINS OF OLD LATIN. In four volumes. Vol. IV. ARCHAIC INSCRIPTIONS. Translated by E. H. Warmington.

## GREEK

345 ATHENAEUS. Seven volumes, Vol. VII, Book XIV, 653b-end; Book XV and Index to whole work. Translated by C. B. Gulick.

358 DIO CHRYSOSTOM. Five volumes. Vol. III. DISCOURSES XXXI-XXXVI. Translated by J. W. Cohoon and H. Lamar Crosby.

357 DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS. ROMAN ANTIQUITIES. Seven volumes. Vol. III, Books V and VI, Chs. 1-48. Translated by E. Cary.

360 GREEK LITERARY PAPYRI. Vol. I (Poetry). Selected and edited by D. L. Page.

350 MANETHO. Translated by W. G. Waddell. PTOLEMY, TETRABLOS. Translated by F. E. Robbins.

308 MINOR ATTIC ORATORS. Two volumes. Vol. I. ANTIOPHON, ANDOCIDES. Translated by K. Maidment.

356 NONNOS, DIONYSIACA. Three volumes. Vol. III, Books XXXVI-XLVIII. Translated by W. H. D. Rouse.

343 PROCOPIUS. Seven volumes. Vol. VII. ON BUILDINGS and Index to whole work. Translated by H. B. Dewing.

*Machine or Mind?* (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library). Free together with *Descriptive Prospectus, &c.*

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

## PHILIP V of MACEDON

by F. W. WALBANK

18s. net

In this study of Philip V, and the story of his vain struggle to maintain Macedonian supremacy in the Balkan Peninsula, the author examines the internal social and political conditions of Macedon, and their effects upon Philip's policy, and traces, from the Macedonian aspects, the history of his relations with Rome.

Cambridge  
University Press

## HORACE JUVENAL and MONTAIGNE

by R. C. TREVELYAN

7s. 6d. net

The Epistles, four Satires, and the *Ars Poetica* of Horace, together with the third Satire of Juvenal, translated into blank verse, and two Essays of Montaigne newly translated into modern idiom. The book concludes with two Imaginary Conversations supposed to take place in the year 18 B.C. between Horace and his two friends Tibullus and Maecenas.

Cambridge University Press

UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD, ENGLAND

